

The Canadian Historical Review

VOL. XX

TORONTO, JUNE, 1939

NO. 2

THE CENTENARY OF THE PUBLICATION OF LORD DURHAM'S REPORT

ON April 24, 1838, Lord Durham with his family, staff, and an elaborate equipment of silver plate and other household furnishings set sail on *H.M.S. Hastings* from Portsmouth. Armed, in unprecedented fashion, with "five several Commissions under the Great Seal," he was bound on the most momentous political mission that has ever left England for the British North American provinces. "All the parade of naval reception," wrote Charles Buller, "was of course exhibited on the occasion; the marines were drawn up, and the Officers, with the captain at their head, were on the deck, when Lord Durham, who had been very ill the night before, came looking very pale, and wrapped up in a large cloak, with Lady Durham and his children around him. Painful thoughts arose within me at the sight of a man so distinguished leaving his country with his whole family for what, though an honourable, was still a painful exile, and a duty of arduous responsibility; and when on a sudden the band struck up its loud and slow strain, the sudden excitement brought the tears at once into my eyes." On November 1, a short six months later, Durham left Quebec on the *Inconstant* with a sense of bitter disappointment and frustration. "A sad day and sad departure it was. The streets were crowded; the spectators filled every window and every house-top; and, though every hat was raised as we passed, a deep silence marked the general grief for Lord Durham's departure. His own presentiments depressed him." He found himself on reaching England plunged into political controversy, and the *Report*, when it appeared a few months later, became the centre of bitter animosities on both sides of the Atlantic. Such, as far as Durham could see, for he died in July, 1840, was the conclusion of an enterprise which had started with high hope and determination. "Never, I believe," Buller wrote, "did men embark in any public undertaking with more singleness and honesty of purpose."

No embellishment is needed to heighten either the historical importance or the dramatic quality of these events, but it was not until about 1910, seventy years after Durham's death, that historical scholars began to give his life and work a deserved attention. Since then much has been written, but among the many items it will not be invidious to mention three: Sir Charles Lucas's edition of the *Report* in three volumes (Oxford, 1912); William Smith's calendar of the *Durham papers* in the report of the Public Archives of Canada, 1923; and Professor Chester New's biography (Oxford, 1929). Time, in one respect, has dealt kindly with Durham for it may now be conceded that in spite of defects in the *Report*, no state paper ever issued by the British government has had a more profound influence on the course of Canadian history or on the development of British policy throughout the empire as a whole.

The *Report* was made public in England in February, 1839, and in Canada in the following April. Merits and defects can now be seen clearly in perspective, and it is fitting that an attempt should be made in this centenary year to appraise the *Report* in the light of recent scholarship and to place it in its historical setting more clearly than has hitherto been done. As a contribution to that end the CANADIAN HISTORICAL REVIEW presents the articles which appear in this issue.

The REVIEW is greatly indebted to His Excellency Lord Tweedsmuir, the governor-general of Canada, for his contribution to this special issue. Lord Tweedsmuir's discerning tribute is from an address delivered by him at the annual dinner of the University of Toronto Law Club in 1938. It is a happy coincidence that the first in this series of commemorative articles should be written by a successor in office to Lord Durham, but the REVIEW welcomes His Excellency even more warmly to its pages because as John Buchan he has won for himself a distinguished place among the historians of the English-speaking world.

The articles which follow Lord Tweedsmuir's were presented during February, 1939, as public lectures by the department of history at the University of Toronto. Two of the lectures were given by members of the department; the others by Professor Chester New, of McMaster University and author of the biography of Lord Durham, and Professor D. C. Harvey, archivist of the province of Nova Scotia. It is impossible to treat every aspect of the subject in so short a series, but on the aspects with which the articles deal they do present both new material and a re-appraisal of accepted views.

LORD DURHAM

LORD DURHAM died within two years of his return to England, disappointed, misunderstood, bitterly criticized, his brief career having closed in apparent failure. But his dying words were, "Canada will some day do justice to my memory," and the family motto of the Lambtons was, "Le jour viendra." That day has come. The world has long ago done ample justice to his work and he stands high on the roll of the makers of the Canadian nation.

A century is a long time, but till the other day there were men alive who had seen him. Lord Strathcona, whom I knew in my youth, saw Durham, and was reprimanded for omitting to remove his hat. What manner of man was this English peer, whose dark, eager, melancholy face looks down on us in our dining-room at Rideau Hall from the canvas of Sir Thomas Lawrence. He was that not uncommon type, the radical aristocrat. The nobleman with popular sympathies is apt to cut a slightly ridiculous figure, like the Jacobinical *ci-devants* of the French Revolution. The world, remembering the Rockinghams and Lafayettes of history, suspects a lack of humour and of common humanity. I remember Lord Rosebery once telling me that, in his early days, when he was Mr. Gladstone's chief lieutenant and the apostle of Scottish Liberalism, he was always in terror of being tarred with that brush. The reason is plain; such a type is apt to be condescending, and democracy has no use for condescension. Durham's political creed was mainly a family bequest and not altogether suited to his temperament. He was called "Radical Jack" and "The King of the Colliers," but I wonder how much he really understood that fine stock, the Durham miners! He was their master, and their patron; I doubt if he could ever have been their comrade and friend. But he had one truly liberal quality: he hated cruelty and tyranny of any kind; and he was as vehement a critic of the brutality and intimidation of the miners' unions as of the misdeeds of Tory landlords.

What was the nature of the man? There is not much to attract us in the malicious picture drawn by Charles Greville. Durham came in for a good deal of criticism in his day. He was accused of class pride and personal vanity. His enemies said he was quick-tempered, intolerant, and suspicious. The fact is perhaps that he had been rather spoilt by home indulgence in his youth. He was capable of deep affection, as the beautiful letters

to his wife and children show, but that affection was mainly confined to his family circle. To the world at large he presented a cold, aloof demeanour, varied by sudden fits of temper. There was something febrile in his nature, as in Canning's, which was not altogether due to his wretched health. He was respected and feared, but not generally liked. It might have been said of him, as was said of an English statesman of our own day—he had not an enemy in the world, but he was cordially disliked by his many friends.

In politics he was not always a reliable colleague—which was a fault, but, as was shown by his friendship with Canning, he was no narrow party man—which we must count as a merit. He was a genuine reformer and compelled the Whigs to extend their reforming zeal to more vital things than the franchise. Here is his own statement of his creed: "I do not wish new institutions but to preserve and strengthen the old. Some would confine the advantages of those institutions to as small a class as possible, I would throw them open to all who have the ability to comprehend them and the vigour to protect them. Others again would annihilate them for the purpose of forming new ones on fanciful and untried principles. I would not only preserve them, but increase their efficiency and add to the number of their supporters." If he had been sitting in the British parliament today I fancy he would have allied himself with the younger Conservatives. In his own day he may be said to have lacked what Cavour called the *tact des choses possibles*. He was magnificent in generalities but somewhat maladroit in tactics. But no one ever questioned his courage. The man who, sick and weary, undertook at short notice the mission to Canada had a very stout heart.

About his abilities it is hard to decide. He had a great gift of somewhat florid torrential oratory, but that is no uncommon thing. He had foresight, too, and imagination beyond most of his contemporaries. Indeed, in the decorous and somewhat drab circle of Whig statesmen he moved like a panther among polar bears. But it is not possible to put him, I think, in the first rank of nineteenth-century statesmanship, with Peel and Gladstone and Disraeli. There is a delightful story of his children once discussing whether their father's name in a hundred years' time would be mentioned in the history of England; and his son Charles, the "Master Lambton" of the picture, said, "I hope they will put it this way: 'In the reign of George IV lived the famous Mr. Lambton—he was a man of considerable talents.'" That is

about the truth. He is famous, he will always be famous; but his talents were not more than considerable. The work he accomplished was greater than the man.

It is of that work I would speak. It is curious that all his years of laborious political agitation in England, his cabinet offices, his diplomatic successes, should be utterly forgotten, and that he should be remembered only by his few months in Canada. When Durham started on his mission Canada was virtually in revolution. The government, both in Lower and Upper Canada, had broken down, and the constitution was in fact suspended. England was comprehensively bored with the whole subject. Many believed that annexation by the United States was inevitable. Liberal English statesmen like Lord John Russell held that responsible government for Canada meant a separation for good and all, and that it would be better to separate at once rather than attempt a foolish experiment. Tory statesmen like the Duke of Wellington declared, to quote Wellington's words, that "local self-government and the sovereignty of Great Britain were completely incompatible." With such a difficult background of home opinion Durham began his work. He found French and British in Quebec at bitter enmity, and the British in Ontario torn by dissensions, and the United States very ready to fish in troubled waters. He found, too, that questions like the fate of the political prisoners and the clergy reserves had complicated the real problem.

I need not remind you of the main lines of his *Report*. Some of his work did not endure. The union of Upper and Lower Canada, designed to provide an English majority, led to a stalemate and had to be reversed; but it should be remembered that Durham regarded this as only a temporary expedient, and looked forward always to that scheme of federation which was to be realized in the next thirty years. The foundation stone of his structure was the gift of responsible government, and that endured. The kernel of the *Report* is to be found in the famous words, "The Crown must consent to carry the government on by means of those in whom the representative members have confidence." The old gibe that Durham had little to do with the *Report*, that it was conceived by Gibbon Wakefield, written by Charles Buller, and only signed by Durham, has no truth in it; the *Report*, it is clear, was Durham's own from start to finish. There was nothing novel in the doctrine. It was the creed of Burke and Fox, of Pitt and Canning; it had long been the accepted British policy.

Durham's achievement lay in the fact that he had the courage to give it a wider application, to shake off the dead hand of colonial office paternalism and to trust the Canadian people. I need not remind you that there may be as much originality in applying an accepted creed to novel conditions as in inventing a new one.

He returned, as I have said, to misunderstanding, abuse, criticism, and to death. He was not to see the fulfilment of his hopes. That had to be the task of Lord Elgin, the ablest, I think, of nineteenth-century viceroys, and of great Canadians like Robert Baldwin. Durham had ruined his own career by his work in Canada, but he had helped to build a nation. He made Britain proud of Canada, and Canada proud of Britain and of herself. I am no lover of what is too much the fashion today, what I might call "ideological intolerance," under which this or that system of government is declared to be the only absolute truth; a system of government which suits one country may be less suitable for another. But I believe that democracy in the widest sense must remain the creed of western civilization, of the French, British, and American peoples, for it is consonant with something very deep in their tradition and spirit. Of that democracy, responsible government is the core and heart, and we do well to pay tribute to a man who sacrificed health and reputation in its cause.

TWEEDSMUIR

Government House, Ottawa.

LORD DURHAM AND THE BRITISH BACKGROUND OF HIS REPORT

THE topic originally assigned to me for this occasion was "The British background of the Durham mission and *Report*." But since Lord Durham is an essential part of the British background, and since this occasion of commemoration calls for special personal emphasis on Durham, I have attempted to weave together the career of Lord Durham and the developments in Great Britain which have the most important bearing on the *Report*. That is what I mean by "Lord Durham and the British background."

During the first four decades of the nineteenth century in Great Britain, humanity was on the march. It was an exuberant age. Its creed was the perfectability of humanity. Its dreams beckoned to a succession of milleniums. Lord Durham was born at its dawn and he left it at the height of its achievement. Looking back at that time, we can distinguish as the most potent of its forces the industrial revolution, the education of the middle and lower classes, and the advance of democracy. Lord Durham lived his life close to all of them and discerned their significance clearly. As one of the greatest coal-owners in the north of England he found himself at the heart of the industrial revolution, and in close contact with its conceptions of progress and its middle-class leaders. On the other hand, while he was the first Lord Durham, his family had a prouder lineage than most of the titled nobility. From the time the young "king of the coal country" entered the house of commons he was the strongest personal link between the landed ruling class and the middle-class leaders. His own education had been scientific and practical to a considerable extent and he had a fine appreciation of the significance of educational progress among the middle and lower classes. These were factors in making a more convinced democrat of one whose father had been an associate and disciple of Fox, and the chairman of the Friends of the People. Canadians rightly think of Lord Durham's *Report* as blazing the way to their first full and effective democracy, but next in importance to that was its appreciation of Canadian economic problems and its insistence on adequate popular education as a basis for Canada's democracy and well-being.

It is no part of my task to trace in detail the history of that movement for parliamentary reform, which aimed at the destruction of oligarchy and the rotten borough system, and resulted in the great Reform Bill of 1832, with its establishment of a uniform

suffrage, and its enfranchisement of the whole middle class and an upper fringe of the working class. Although it was largely an achievement of Radicals creating a popular movement which brought pressure to bear on parliament from without, Durham was its most urgent, most liberal, and most outspoken champion in the ruling class. As early as 1820 he brought into parliament the first parliamentary reform measure which emanated from that class, a reform bill which was strikingly similar to the triumphant Reform Bill of 1832. His parliamentary support at first was weak enough, but although he could see black for a few days at a time, as he frequently saw red in his fiery passions, he was a man who could never be discouraged. In season and frequently out of season he urged on his father-in-law Lord Grey, the veteran Whig leader, that parliamentary reform should be adopted as the party policy. That decision was made in 1830, when the movement outside of parliament came to a head, the Tory government fell because of Wellington's stand against any degree of reform, and Grey and the Whigs came in. A few weeks later the new prime minister said to Durham, "I wish you would take our Reform Bill in hand," suggesting the formation of a committee to prepare the bill, of which Durham was to be chairman and Lord John Russell a member. In that committee of four, Durham's and Russell's were always the dominating minds, and the most liberal features of the great measure which they prepared were due to Durham's insight and insistence. He wrote the report of the committee with his own hand. It was the first of his four reports and, although much shorter in form, it displayed the same ability as marked his reports on Russia, Belgium, and Canada. In order to preserve its secrecy until the cabinet met, all the copies of this report for cabinet members were made by Lady Durham and their daughter who was to be the Lady Elgin of Canadian history.

I need not detail here the dramatic fight for the bill which lasted for a year and a quarter. Although Durham spoke seldom in parliament, he was relentlessly active in committee and cabinet, and, if at times he strained his own frayed nerves and those of others to the breaking point and tempers flew, he succeeded in preventing the bill from being mutilated. While it was probably Brougham who invented the slogan, "The Bill, the whole Bill and nothing but the Bill," that was Durham's policy throughout, and he gave it its leadership, while outside of parliament excited mass-meetings cheered his name to the echo. The bill effected the most significant revolution in British history. It destroyed oligarchy,

and while it did not achieve democracy at one stroke, it was an important step on the road to democracy, and it created an electorate much more receptive to liberal measures. I have given some time to it here because, if "the old parliamentary system" had existed in Great Britain five years later when rebellion broke out in Canada, there would have been no solution of Canadian problems, and Canada could not have achieved democracy along the lines of Lord Durham's *Report*. Although Durham in the early thirties knew little of Canada and probably thought of it as countless acres of snow, with every effort for the Reform Bill he was preparing the way for his own great work for us in 1838 and 1839.

Another aspect of the Reform Bill has too frequently escaped the attention of historians. Not only did it make the house of commons to which the government was generally responsible more representative of the people, it greatly weakened the power of the king. Before the Reform Bill, the king, unless the party balance was very one-sided, could turn ministries out and bring them in at will because there were always enough rotten boroughs more or less controlled by government patronage to give a new government a majority in the commons. After the Reform Bill that manipulation was not possible, and the king could not move without the support of a government controlled by a free electorate. Shortly after the Reform Bill there came the completion of the process by which what we call responsible government—the principle that a government must have the support of a majority in the house of commons—was established in Great Britain. After William IV dismissed the Melbourne government in the fall of 1834, Peel dissolved parliament, was defeated in the ensuing election, and after parliament met in 1835, continued his government for several months in the face of an adverse parliamentary majority. In working through the Peel manuscripts in the British Museum a short time ago, I ran across a letter written at the time of Metcalfe's Canadian governorship, in which Peel said that Metcalfe was the man for him and looking back at 1835 said that he (Peel) stayed in as long as he could, that he did not resign until he could govern no longer.¹ It is clear that Sir Robert Peel in 1835 did not recognize a rigid constitutional rule that a ministry must resign or dissolve parliament when it lost a parliamentary majority. But it is equally clear that after 1835 no British minister would take such a position and after 1834 no British monarch would dismiss a ministry that was supported by a parliamentary majority.

¹British Museum, *Add. mss.* 40482, f. 147, Peel to Brougham, Jan. 30, 1845.

William IV's humiliation in taking back a ministry which he had dismissed and Peel's experience in 1835 settled those questions for all time so far as Great Britain was concerned. What we call conventions of the constitution develop as habits develop, and the process by which practice hardened into habit and habit into rule was completed in respect to this most important of all conventions, to which we have given the technical name of responsible government, only four years before Lord Durham recommended its application to Canada.

The Reform Bill and its new electorate brought into the house of commons a sufficient number of Radicals to create a three-party situation. In the period preceding Lord Durham's *Report* the Whigs were in power depending on the support of the Radicals for a majority. The real issue lay between Conservatives and Radicals; it was essentially the issue between aristocracy and democracy. The Whigs were fated to die out and leave the field to the other two, Radicals developing into mid-century Liberals, just as in our century the Liberals themselves, a middle party, died down to leave the field to Conservatives and Labour. But at the time of the *Report*, Melbourne was still in power maintaining a rickety Whig government that might be destroyed at any moment.

The Radicals usually called themselves Reformers, sometimes Radical Reformers. In Canada in the same period the political parties were called Tories and Reformers. The term Whig was rarely employed in Canadian politics. Nobody in Canada could really be a Whig. The head and centre of that party in England was a closely intermarried group of aristocratic and blue-blooded families. As Charles Lamb said, "These damned Whigs are all cousins." None of the cousins came to Canada.

Lord Durham's *Report* was the combined product of Durham's insight, foresight, and courage on the one hand, and on the other certain ideas of government that had been developed within the Reform party in Canada. One aspect of the British background of the *Report* consists of the influence of British radicalism or liberalism on the Canadian Reformers. That influence operated, roughly speaking, through three channels: the political ideas and outlook of the thousands who moved from one country to the other in this greatest period of emigration from Britain to Canada; the reporting in various ways to new Britain of the doings of old Britain; and the direct influence and advice of Radical leaders, particularly Hume and Roebuck.

The Reformers in Canada did not adopt the same political programme as the Reformers in Great Britain. The extension of the franchise was not a goal of endeavour, because in Canada the franchise was already democratic in character. But assembly members democratically elected found themselves thwarted by the fact that an oligarchic legislative council could throw out their measures when it pleased, and an oligarchic executive administered the government no matter how elections might go. Reformers in Canada found in that oligarchy many of the objectionable features of the oligarchic government which they had learned to hate in England. The solution advanced by most Canadian Radicals after 1833 was an elective legislative council, but there was a small minority who believed in the application to Canada of the British principle of the responsibility of the executive to a majority in the people's house, the solution advanced and developed in Lord Durham's *Report*.

Some features of the British Radical programme were directly transferred to Canada. To the more discerning British Radicals the ballot was as important as franchise extension. No one can explore the *Place manuscripts* in the British Museum or the British newspapers of the period without realizing that for many of the Radicals the ballot was what they were to seek first and all things would be added unto it. In many of the manifestoes of Canadian Reformers the demand for the ballot occurs. In 1835 a ballot bill was passed by the assembly of Upper Canada and rejected by the legislative council. Another aim of the British Radicals was educational development and particularly secular education. The Canadian Reformers made secular education one of their ideals.

The conduct of the house of lords in the Reform Bill crisis, followed by their rejection of several liberal measures, roused the indignation of British Radicals and from 1834 to 1838 we hear a great deal about the reform of the house of lords. I find that in the summer of 1833 that idea was already in men's minds and even in a *Times* editorial the question was raised, what should be done with the lords? In that summer two influential Canadian politicians, Mackenzie and Viger, were in England in close touch with the Radical leaders, Hume and Roebuck. Immediately after their return to Canada we hear for the first time of a movement in both provinces for an elective upper house. That speedily became the chief demand of the Canadian Reformers.

From 1834 to 1839 the British government insisted that the one thing that was impossible so far as Canada was concerned was

making the legislative councils elective, and the reason for that position was obviously the fact that a movement for an elective or partially elective house of lords was in full swing throughout those years. Many of you have heard of William IV's outburst in this connection. Here is Hobhouse's account as he recorded it in his diary when it was white hot: "Saturday, July 11 in Downing St. Lord Melbourne addressed us as follows, 'Gentlemen, you may as well know how you stand;' and pulling a paper from his pocket he read a memorandum of a conversation between the King and Lord Gosford. . . . The King said to Lord Gosford: 'Mind what you are doing in Canada. By God! I will never consent to make the Council elective. Mind me, my lord, the Cabinet is not my Cabinet; they had better take care or I will have them impeached.' We all stared at each other. Melbourne said 'He is evidently in a state of great excitement.'"² So far as that particular question was concerned the king might have spared his wrath. The government needed no warning from him. Tories and Whigs alike went in fear of the movement against the lords until after the date of Lord Durham's *Report*.

To return to the career of Lord Durham. In 1833 he had resigned from Lord Grey's cabinet and although the cause was apparently illness, it was evident that where most of the Whigs regarded the Reform Bill as a "finality," and would hear of no more parliamentary reform in their generation, Durham regarded it as only a beginning. In that he took common ground with the Radicals and at a great meeting in Glasgow in October, 1834, he came out for the Radical programme of the ballot, shorter parliaments, and the franchise for all householders. A number of the candidates in the election of 1835 were described as "Durhamites" which meant left-wing Whigs. From that time until his death there were persistent rumours of an impending government of left-wing Whigs and Radicals with Durham as prime minister. It was never a possibility, because such a combination could not secure a majority in parliament or in the electorate. Any definite move in that direction would have thrown the Tories and conservative Whigs together. But the situation worried the Whigs under Melbourne with their small parliamentary majority.

Durham was excluded from the second Melbourne government, an exclusion which Lord Grey himself advised because he regarded him as a Radical. In place of cabinet office he was appointed ambassador to St. Petersburg. From our point of view, perhaps

²Lord Broughton, *Recollections* (London, 1909-11), V, 42.

the most important thing in connection with that embassy was Durham's report on Russia, which Palmerston described as one of the ablest and clearest statements ever sent to the foreign office by an ambassador.

By the beginning of 1837 the Radical supporters of the Melbourne government, on whom it depended for its life, were growing restless and developing a rebellious frame of mind. In January at a Radical dinner in Bath, Roebuck demanded of the government that the ballot, further extension of the franchise, and reform of the house of lords be made open questions. If that was not granted "we will turn them out." And Molesworth declared that if the government "did not consent to a fair and equal union between the popular party and themselves . . . their tenure of office . . . would be of short duration."³ Some Radicals felt differently. Joseph Parkes wrote to Ellice, "Damn and blast their exquisite Tom foolery,"⁴ and at a Middlesex Reform dinner, Hume urged that "they would act as one man in keeping the Tories out of office."⁵ But when Russell moved his Canada resolutions in March, Hume attacked the government as violently as did Roebuck. From forty-six to fifty-six Radicals voted against the various resolutions and the government was saved from defeat by the support of the opposition, but it was in almost daily danger and it was a Canadian question that was most to be feared.

In June Durham returned from Russia. That was a god-send to the government. He was for counselling prudence to the violent Radicals and he had an influence with them such as no other man possessed. If the government showed him marked favour the Radicals might be won back. And such marked favour had better be in relation to Canada which was the danger point. More disturbing news than ever was coming from a Canada on the brink of rebellion. A month after his return from Russia Melbourne asked Durham to accept the governorship of Canada. It would be a sacrifice but he asked him to make it for the sake of patriotism. "You are the fittest man for it. . . . You have every quality which will enable you to perform such a duty, and your character, your station . . . your abilities and your principles all combine to give you a weight and influence, and command for you a respect and a confidence, which will attend upon no other individual." It was like Melbourne to add, "This pro-

³*The Times*, Jan. 7, 1837.

⁴Lambton Castle, *Lambton mss.*, Jan. 8, 1837; quoted in Chester New, *Lord Durham* (Oxford, 1929), 306.

⁵*The Times*, Jan. 24, 1837.

position may be attributed to motives of present political interest and convenience. If you draw this inference, I must submit to it."⁶ Durham refused the appointment.

By that time Brougham the greatest parliamentary debater of the day had finally and openly broken with the Whigs, was all for the Radicals, and was corresponding with both Radical and Tory leaders in the hope of bringing them together on some question, any question, that would bring about the destruction of the government. In December the news of rebellion in Canada reached England. The Radical leaders broke out into veritable war-dances in parliament, at the Crown and Anchor tavern, and elsewhere.

On January 13, 1838, the *Times* published a Canadian boat song, arranged for two voices, Russell's and Glenelg's. Russell sang,

Wo, brother, wo, the time flies fast,
Our trial is near, the recess is past.

and the last lines of the song are,

Wo, brother, wo, our day is past,
The Melbourne Cabinet cannot last.

The "Canadian boat song," by the way, was the one thing about Canada that everybody in England seemed to know.

If the Tories decided to attack the government only one thing could save it,—appeasing the Radicals by placing the control and settlement of Canadian affairs in the hands of Lord Durham. To point out that that was the political situation is not to say that there were not other reasons for the appointment. One who does not think highly of the Melbourne government need not think of it so poorly as to suppose that, with Canada in rebellion, it considered only its own tenure of office. And there is every reason to believe that Melbourne and his colleagues—his colleagues more than Melbourne—considered Durham to be in any case the best man for the job. But politicians do not always select those whom they consider the best men. Most of them did not love Durham. Governments as well as individuals act from mixed motives. The political situation was certainly an important factor. The appointment was a Radical triumph.

Its announcement was greeted with almost universal acclaim. The Whigs were naturally loud in their praise, and Lord John Russell stressed Durham's liberal opinions and the fact "that he

⁶Lambton mss., July 22, 1837; quoted in New, *Lord Durham*, 312-13.

was favourable to popular feelings and popular rights."⁷ One Radical speaker in parliament said that "his name was a rallying point for freedom and that no wiser selection could have been made."⁸ Of the Radical leaders, Grote said that he decided not to vote against the government "after hearing the determination to send out the Earl of Durham."⁹ Leader said: "It is a fortunate thing for the present ministers that they have connected with them a man like Lord Durham. If any man of all their party could settle the differences in Canada and restore good government to that unhappy country . . . he is the man."¹⁰ Only seven Radicals voted against the first reading of the bill which made temporary provision for the government of Canada. The Tories joined in acclaiming Durham's appointment, but in a very different tone. The *Tory Times* said: "We have no disrespect for Lord Durham; he is an honourable and right-minded English nobleman. We are surprised that . . . he should not consider what class of men he has to please at home. Lord Durham and Joseph Hume . . . can have no more sentiments in common than an angel and a Hottentot; and yet his Lordship . . . must please Joseph Hume, Mr. Grote *cum multis aliis* of that description, as well as Lords Melbourne and Johnny Russell, who are dependent on Joseph and Grote for their existence as Ministers."¹¹ The Tory Gladstone, in the course of the debate, objected to the arbitrary powers conferred on Lord Durham, powers, he said, which would have raised a storm of protest from the Radicals under any other circumstances and yet there were not ten Radicals prepared to oppose this bill. "In short," he continued, "there never was a more happily timed appointment than that of the Earl of Durham. Like the twin stars, forthwith with his appearance, *concidunt venti fugiuntque nubes*. [The winds subside and the clouds fly away.]"¹²

Against the background which I have traced, Durham appears as the gift to Canada of British radicalism,—British liberalism if you like. That becomes more apparent when we look at the men he took with him to Canada. They were nearly all Radicals. Two of them certainly made large contributions to the *Report*. In a critical appendix to my life of Durham I attempted to examine all the evidence on the question of the authorship of the *Report*. Such an analysis dissolves all doubt as to Durham's authorship. But most of the matters discussed had been the

⁷*Hansard*, 3rd series, XL, 7.

⁸*Ibid.*, 114.

⁹*Ibid.*, 406.

¹⁰*Ibid.*, 329.

¹¹*The Times*, Jan. 17, 1838.

¹²*Hansard*, 3rd series, XL, 439.

subject of many conversations with Buller and Wakefield, and while the main decisions and recommendations were undoubtedly Durham's, they must be given some share of the credit. Buller was a Radical member of parliament, Wakefield was Radical in activities and in background.

Another Radical attached to Durham's mission was William Kennedy who was taken out to investigate and report on the question of municipal government. He had been associated with the working out of the Municipal Corporations Act in Great Britain, which had three years before the Durham mission, not only democratized municipal government but created in many parts of the country a real municipal government where nothing approaching it had existed before. The work of the sub-commission to which Kennedy was attached, and Durham's own strong emphasis on the subject in the main report, laid the basis of Sydenham's establishment of municipal institutions in Lower Canada and a greatly improved municipal system in Upper Canada.

Between the time of his appointment and his sailing Durham sought and received much advice in regard to Canada. The British merchants engaged in the Canada trade urged on him the idea of a legislative union of Upper and Lower Canada. But that came originally from the Montreal merchants and Durham was to hear a great deal of it after his arrival in Canada. A federal union of all the British North American colonies was urged upon him from several quarters,—Howick, Ellice, Roebuck. Glenelg, the colonial secretary, had referred to it favourably in parliament. Durham clung to it until shortly before he left Canada, then hesitated, and finally abandoned it after his return to England because of maritime difficulties, the second insurrection, and his realization of the fact that no British government would consent to it immediately after the second insurrection. But the *Report* presented with enthusiasm the dream of an ultimate national union.

He carried with him to Canada a prejudice, deep-rooted in the English ruling class, that the French Canadians were a disloyal and lamentably inferior people who could never fit into the providential scheme of things until in some mysterious manner they were made over into Englishmen. In general he retained that view and wrote it into his *Report*, although his instincts of justice urged the adoption of fair dealing with the French.

The central recommendation of the *Report*, that of responsible

government, he certainly did not get from England where there was no advocacy of it before he left for Canada or indeed before the publication of the *Report*. He got that in Canada mainly from Baldwin and Hincks. But if Baldwin is the father of responsible government, his was a voice crying in the Canadian woods until a British statesman was willing to take up the idea and champion it, as Durham did. And Durham fitted it into imperial relationships in a fuller and more adequate manner than was ever conceived by Baldwin. He also envisaged and cleared away its difficulties more thoroughly.

Between Durham in Canada and the government in England trouble developed rapidly. His relations with Melbourne had been badly strained by the controversy on the Turton appointment before the storm broke over his ordinance banishing political prisoners. Certainly one part of that ordinance was illegal, the part relating to the retention of the prisoners in Bermuda. Lord Brougham, eager for any opportunity to weaken the government, attacked the ordinance with all his legal acumen and all his vigour and eloquence. Then he introduced a bill indemnifying all concerned in the illegality, a most humiliating measure. The ministers learned that Brougham had concocted his attack with Roebuck, Leader, and other prominent Radicals. The latter apparently loved the Canadian rebels more even than they loved Durham. The Radicals were divided on the question, but there seemed to be little doubt that when Brougham's bill reached the commons it would have the support of the solid Tory phalanx and enough Radicals to defeat the government, which could not survive such a defeat. The only other course open to the government had been to introduce supplementary legislation to provide for the Bermuda difficulty, but in the temper of the moment such a measure would have met with the same fate. So they disallowed Durham's ordinance and supported Brougham's bill. Apart from the fact that there was no heroism in the Melbourne government, they did not see why they should make the supreme sacrifice for a proconsul whose pride had quarrelled with them at every turn. Canada, now that it was no longer in rebellion, need not be considered over much; they were playing *British* politics.

Durham, in Quebec, sensitive and quick-tempered as usual, his mind and soul engaged by *Canadian* problems and the *Canadian* future, saw things very differently. To him, this was the supreme betrayal. When he read the news in an American newspaper and on the same evening told Buller that he would resign, he may

have acted in anger and pride. But he did not write to the British government for nearly a week. He took time for reflection, and he became assured not only that he could not count on the Melbourne government supporting his authority in Canada, but also that Westminster and Downing street were the places where the welfare of Canada must be established. With his vision of Canadian democracy and Canadian self-government working itself out in his mind, this experience quickened his determination that the interests of Canada must no longer be at the mercy of British politics, and that henceforth Canadian politics must determine Canadian policies. But for the moment the new system that was to be established must be made amenable to British politics. Otherwise it could not be established at all. That is not to say that Durham himself foresaw how dramatic his home-coming was to be, and how his *Report* was to be presented to the British public and the British parliament in the midst of an electric political situation.

I shall not discuss here the wisdom of his proclamation of October 9. That I think was very questionable. I mention the matter not because it antagonized the French Canadians, but because it alienated British public sentiment. The support, however, of the Radicals, always fickle in their politics, was swinging back strongly to Durham, and John Stuart Mill wrote an article in the Radical review, the *London and Westminster*, that defended Durham's proclamation in masterly fashion and revived the old dream of a really liberal government under Durham's leadership. Molesworth rallied his following in the same direction. By the time Durham arrived in England the Radicals were ready to support him in an attack on the government. It was hoped that a number of left-wing Whigs would follow Durham whom they had always admired. And such an attack would be supported by Brougham, the mightiest gladiator of them all.

That brings me, for the moment, to a popular fallacy in regard to the British background of the Canadian situation in 1838—the supposition that Brougham attacked the Durham ordinance on account of his quarrel with Durham begun in 1834. Brougham, by the way, said that they had never quarrelled, that they did not speak to each other, that was all—a statement that is a bit puzzling to ordinary mortals. The fact that Durham was involved added a relish to the feast no doubt, but the humiliation of the Melbourne government was the great thing with Brougham. In

a series of letters to Macvey Napier—they are among the unpublished Napier letters in the British Museum—immediately after the government had disallowed the ordinance at Brougham's command and had accepted his indemnity bill, Brougham wrote: "My victory over the Government is complete. . . . You must have seen him Melbourne and his colleagues to know how low and mean they looked. . . . So far from letting the Government know what my hostility is, I have as yet hardly laid the tip of my little finger on them. . . . As they cannot abuse me more for really trying to turn them out, they shall see what they shall see next session."¹³ England was amazed at what Brougham had done that session. At the beginning of 1838 he had opened up an attack on the apprenticeship system which still held the negroes of the West Indies in semi-slavery, pleading with his greatest eloquence for their complete freedom. That had been opposed by both political parties, but the British public rose to Brougham's challenge and a popular movement, featured by a series of mass meetings addressed by Brougham, had swept both parties before it and on the first of August every slave in the West Indies went free at last. In the same month of August he had forced the government's hand on the Durham ordinance. Macaulay and Brougham did not like one another. (I suspect that one reason was that there was never room for both of them in the same conversation.) At this time Macaulay wrote to Napier in regard to Brougham: "He has done wonders this session. A mere tongue, without a party . . . in an unfriendly audience and with an unfriendly press, never did half so much before. As Sydney Smith says, verily he hath a devil."¹⁴

Brougham had attacked Melbourne personally that session with almost superhuman invective, and Melbourne in reply had shown that he had almost as sharp a tongue as Brougham. Brougham and Durham had not spoken to one another for years. Brougham and Melbourne were not speaking to one another. Durham did not speak to Melbourne for months after his return from Canada. For people who like to get their politics in terms of personalities, and that, after all, includes the mass of humanity, this three-cornered duel was an absorbing affair and it was not the least exciting feature in the British background of Lord Durham's *Report*. As he returned to England just before the presentation of the *Report* the first question on everybody's lips was "What will Lord Durham do?" The next question was

¹³*Add. mss.* 34,619, f. 292-3, 327 ff. ¹⁴*Ibid.*, f. 355.

"What will Lord Brougham do?" One persistent surmise was that they would unite to destroy Melbourne. By the time of Durham's arrival, the Radicals were ready to support him if he would attack the government. While he was at sea, Lord John Russell wrote to Melbourne, "If they succeed in getting Durham to lead the movement [the Radical drive] your tenure of office may be very short."¹⁵

When Durham reached England a letter from Wakefield was waiting for him. Wakefield was in London studying the political situation and he wrote: "They [the Government] will submit to your terms. They feel that they are at your mercy . . . I would not deceive you or mislead you for the world. You took me by the hand when I was proscribed; and I would die in your service."¹⁶

Molesworth and his Radicals arranged a series of meetings for Durham along his road to London, but the latter was careful to give no indication of his attitude to the government. Greville, who did not like Durham although he conceded that he was "a clever man" who could "both write and speak well," wrote in his diary: "If notoriety upon any terms could satisfy anybody, Lord Durham would have ample reason for contentment, as his name is in everybody's mouth, and the chief topic of every newspaper and political periodical."¹⁷

If the Melbourne government was dependent upon Durham for its life, it is equally clear that Durham was dependent upon the Melbourne government for favourable action on his *Report*. The plan of the Radicals was to have Durham lead them against the government, overthrow it, bring in the Tories, and then trust to the electorate to bring in a Durham Radical government. The latter part of that programme was, I think, fantastic. The former part could be put into immediate operation. But what then would have happened to Durham's recommendations for Canada? It is not difficult to envisage the reception that would have been accorded to them by a Conservative government, with Stanley, let us say, at the colonial office. Canada came first in Durham's mind. To put it in crude commercial terms, he was not in the position of being able to buy concessions from both political parties. He had to buy from Melbourne and Melbourne had to sell to him.

So, while he would not meet any of the ministers socially

¹⁵Public Record Office, *Russell mss.*, "G. and D. 22": 3, Nov. 22, 1838.

¹⁶Public Archives of Canada, *Durham papers*, 6, II, 466 ff.; quoted in New, *Lord Durham*, 478.

¹⁷Henry Reeve (ed.), *Greville journals* (1896 ed.), IV, 146, Dec. 6, 1838.

except Howick his brother-in-law and Duncannon who was related to his wife, he treated with the government through them. The main terms of the *entente* were that Durham was to support the Melbourne government and the government was to do everything possible for Durham's Canadian recommendations. Both sides fulfilled their parts loyally. I am not sure that the dismissal of Glenelg was part of the agreement; Russell and Howick had been urging that for some time and they would both have left the ministry if Glenelg had remained. But Normanby, who succeeded Glenelg at the colonial office, had been a member of what had been called "Durham & Co." in the days of the Reform Bill; he was a disciple of Durham and a left-wing Whig. The man whom the government appointed to succeed Durham in Canada, Poulett Thomson, was also a member of "Durham & Co."; to change the figure, he belonged to Durham's political body-guard, an intimate friend and confidant, who saw eye to eye with him in British politics. If the union of the Canadas was delayed a little, that was due to later exigencies of British politics that go beyond my topic, but the government made an honest and skilful effort that was ultimately successful. Russell went pretty far in the direction of Durham's responsible government recommendation when he stated in parliament on June 3 that he did not approve of the practice of carrying on the executive government of a British North American colony with a minority in the assembly, and that he desired that "the executive should be carried on in such a way that their measures should be agreeable and acceptable to the representatives of the people." He also conceded a good bit of the essence of responsible government in his instructions to Poulett Thomson. Thomson (or Sydenham) put into immediate operation nearly everything in the *Durham Report* except full responsible government—the union, education, municipal government, judicial reforms, improvements in the clergy reserve situation, amendments in the law of real property, including the establishment of registry offices, the development of public works, the establishment of a rural police in Lower Canada, a new system of county courts, and a stipendiary magistracy. And while he refused to recognize the full principle of responsible government and that had to wait for a few years, Thomson as Lord Sydenham set up in Canada what I have called "the machinery of responsible government."¹⁸ Even to suggest these things is an encroachment on Professor Martin's topic in this series. I

¹⁸See New, *Lord Durham*, 552.

mention them merely to indicate the extent to which the Melbourne government permitted and facilitated the carrying out of the recommendations of the *Durham Report*.

To return from that suggestion of fulfilment to the month of February a hundred years ago. The *Durham Report*, dated and signed on the last day of January, was presented to the government on February 4. On the 8th *The Times* began the publication of the *Report* by instalments. Ordinarily that would never have occurred. But against the background which I have sketched you will understand that for the moment there was a great interest in Canada, partly caused by the rebellion, partly by the exciting political situation when 1838 passed into 1839. The public knew nothing as yet of an arrangement with the government, and anything from the hand of Lord Durham was splendid newspaper copy. So in unexpected fashion the great *Report* was presented to the British public as well as to the British government.

In one important respect the *Report* stands out in striking contrast to everything in the British background. It insisted on laying the basis for a permanent connection of Canada with Great Britain, and it was transfused with the spirit of imperialism. No such suggestion enters at any point into the Canada debates in the British parliament in the preceding months. Speaker after speaker anticipated and gave his blessing to the breaking away of the colonies. The Radicals were not averse to immediate separation. The Tory Gladstone and the Whig Russell believed that an ultimate separation was advisable but not "under present conditions." Against that uniform background of separation sentiment in the British parliament, Lord Durham's *Report* stands out in radiant, confident, and constructive imperial faith.

To the qualities of his mind and character which Lord Durham wrote into his *Report*, I have referred incidentally. May I add a brief summary quoted from my biography: "The *Report* reflects . . . his courage, outspokenness, independence, analytical power, farsightedness, ability to see things in the large, his passion for reform, that combination of a liberalism which appeared rash to others with an instinct for safety which was adequate to the situation, and that gift which had enabled him in more than one crisis to gather up a number of suggestions from various quarters into just that combination that brought order out of chaos,

destroyed an old system, ushered in a new one, and provided the basis for a healthy and continuous development."¹⁹

Sir Charles Lucas, who edited the standard edition of the *Report*, saw constructiveness as its greatest characteristic. "In this constructiveness," he said, "which is embodied in all parts of the Report, he has beyond any other man illustrated in writing the genius of the British race. . . . It is as a race of makers that the English will live to all time and it is as a prophet of a race of makers that Lord Durham lives."²⁰ He did not long survive that February of a hundred years ago. He died in July of the following year. There is a tradition to the effect that shortly before his death, he said, "Canada will one day do justice to my memory." Certainly his thoughts were on Canada in his last hours.

I have no desire to close this on a sentimental note, but there is one aspect of the matter that I feel I cannot leave unmentioned. From his childhood to his death at forty-eight Lord Durham never knew the health that most of us enjoy. Most of his days were days of pain, yet his life was one of tremendous energy. Every period of extraordinary exertion was followed by something approaching a break-down. I have seen all of his children's letters to him that are extant; they habitually refer to his sufferings. He was very ill in Canada, yet he always went back to work too soon, and in the midst of sickness rose to work at four in the morning. Though his health appeared to be better while he was writing his *Report*, he was actually suffering from advanced tuberculosis. Lady Durham's journal shows how hard he worked at it, and from that labour he never recovered. If that be heroism, then we may cherish his memory as that of one of our national heroes.

But there is no virtue in commemorating Lord Durham today and going out tomorrow to confront the national problems of our time with apathy and inaction. In the condition of Canada today there is as clear a call to mind and action as ever came to Durham. After all the spiritual key-note of his *Report* is this: "The people of the North American colonies are a people on whom we may safely rely and to whom we must not grudge power." It is as we use that power, which he secured for us, in a manner worthy of his outlook on life, that we adequately commemorate Lord Durham and his *Report*.

CHESTER NEW

McMaster University.

¹⁹*Ibid.*, 514.

²⁰Sir Charles Lucas (ed.), *Lord Durham's report* (Oxford, 1912), I, 316.

THE DURHAM REPORT AND THE UPPER CANADIAN SCENE

"THE inhabitants of Upper Canada," wrote Lord Durham, "have apparently no unity of interest or opinion." This observation, ordinary enough at first glance, reveals one of those flashes of insight which in Durham's characteristic fashion redeem his *Report* from much that is open to question. In every community there must be developed in the long run some commonly understood "rules-of-the-game," some recognized elements of cohesion. In looking at Upper Canada in the 1830's one feels that here as yet there had scarcely been developed even those mutual assumptions which are necessary to make opponents understandable to each other. Durham attributed this condition chiefly to geography and lack of communications. The population, strung out in irregular settlements from the Ottawa to the Detroit river was, as he said, "scattered along an extensive frontier."

The Province has no great centre with which all the separate parts are connected, and which they are accustomed to follow in sentiment and action; nor is there that habitual intercourse between the inhabitants of different parts of the country, which, by diffusing through all a knowledge of the opinions and interests of each, makes a people one and united, in spite of extent of territory and dispersion of population. Instead of this, there are many petty local centres, the sentiments and the interests (or at least what are fancied to be so) of which, are distinct and perhaps opposed.

To lack of geographical unity there had been added the serious effects of an extreme diversity in the origins and characteristics of the pioneer settlers. The early loyalist groups had been followed into the province before 1812 by thousands of eager landseekers who formed part of the westward movement flooding through upper New York and the Ohio country. They came into Upper Canada mainly for the purpose of securing cheap, good land, and they were apparently quite willing to make any political affiliation, monarchical or republican, which seemed necessary to that end. By 1812 they bade fair to change the character, perhaps even the allegiance, of the province. Following the peace in 1815 there was some reversal of these alarming Americanizing tendencies. Americans still continued to come in, but there began to appear in larger numbers individuals and groups who were the forerunners of the later swarm of immigrants coming direct from the British Isles. In spite of common geographic origin and citizenship, they were a variegated lot, all the way from the

half-pay officer with his Tory and military tradition to the low-born and impecunious labourer. By 1830 the province was a veritable patch-work of settlements with little intercourse and, more important, with little that was common in points of view or attitudes of mind. The first five years of the decade intensified this condition of diversity by a sharp rise in immigration. The population which by official returns¹ (certainly an under-estimate) in 1830 was 211,567, increased by over 130,000 in five years. In several districts, and these incidentally among the most turbulent in the rebellion period, the increase was over, or almost, one hundred per cent. Among the newcomers the Irish appeared in considerable numbers and their presence, to say the least, did little to promote an atmosphere of sweet tranquillity. Differences were sharpened not only by the rapid increase in population but by a no less rapid development of the agencies for organizing and arousing public opinion—the churches, newspapers, and not least the Orange Order which established itself as a powerful influence in the politics of the province during these years.² Rhode Island has been called by American historians the colony of the otherwise minded. Certainly none among the provinces of British North America could claim, in the 1830's, the dubious distinction of having more varieties of otherwise-minded people than Upper Canada.

In the best of circumstances this raw frontier province, and such it was at the beginning of the decade, would have suffered some pains in digesting an over-ambitious meal of incompatible elements, but the difficulties were immeasurably increased by acute economic and religious conflicts which revealed themselves in an increasingly bitter political strife. In none of these aspects, economic, religious, or political was the situation in the province a simple one. In the economic sphere we are reminded of the conflicts during the same years in the United States. As recent studies have admirably shown,³ there can be seen, broadly speak-

¹*Upper Canada, Appendix to the journal of the assembly*, 4th session, 13th parliament, 1839, 464.

²These were the years of the establishment of journalism as an important influence in the life of the province. See W. S. Wallace, "The periodical literature of Upper Canada" (*CANADIAN HISTORICAL REVIEW*, XII, March, 1931); J. J. Talman, "The newspapers of Upper Canada a century ago" (*CANADIAN HISTORICAL REVIEW*, XIX, March, 1938). Professor W. B. Kerr has contributed an informative series of articles on the Orange Order to the *Sentinel*, published in Toronto, beginning with the issue of Jan. 19, 1939. I am indebted to Dr. Talman and Mr. W. D. Reid for assistance in connection with the excellent collection of newspapers in the Ontario Archives.

³For example, Fred Landon, "The common man in the era of the rebellion in Upper Canada" (*Canadian Historical Association report*, 1937); D. G. Creighton, "The economic

ing, in Upper Canadian controversies over land, internal improvements, tariffs, credit and banking, evidences of a surging agrarian discontent against the forces of monopoly, strikingly similar to the discontent which provided so much of the driving power behind Jacksonian democracy in the United States. The average settler in Upper Canada was faced from the moment he entered the province not only with the comparatively high price of land but with red-tape and favouritism rampant in high quarters; in short, with all the evils of a defective land policy and administration.

Once on his land the settler found himself with little that he could market, and that little weighed down by costs of transportation and the profits exacted by a rising and ambitious commercial and financial interest. But the forces of agrarianism were divided. What those in one place wanted was not necessarily a matter of concern to those even a short distance away. Indeed, the individual settler might be divided in his own views. He wanted a route to tidewater and the oversea market, for example; but he also wanted a road to his door, and he was often ready to suspect those who would, in the name of the public interest, tie up the resources of the province in gigantic enterprises such as the building of canals which could only too easily be made the means of fattening the pocket-books of politicians, contractors, and middle men. So the province was economically not divided with complete clarity either by sectional or class interests. This confusion of cross-currents was intensified by the uncertainties of a colonial system approaching its collapse and by the devastating effects of the depression of 1836-7.

The religious scene was no less marked by ferment and division than was the economic.⁴ Several new groups were added during the early years of the decade so that the province by 1835 had the Church of England and Roman Catholic groups, four brands of Presbyterians, two from Scotland and two from the United States, four of Methodists, also with affiliations American and British, two of Baptists, as well as Quakers, Congregationalists, Universalists, and Tunkers. Competition for members in the

background of the rebellions of eighteen thirty-seven" (*Canadian journal of economics and political science*, III, Aug., 1937). See also W. W. Baldwin's analysis of grievances in the *Durham papers* (Public Archives of Canada, *Report*, 1923, 184).

⁴The *Christian guardian* of Feb. 6, 1830, gives the following estimate: Methodists 38,000, Presbyterians 30,000, Church of England 16,500, Roman Catholics 15,000, Quakers 15,000, Mennonites and Tunkers 12,000, Baptists 16,500, English Wesleyan Methodists and Lutherans 10,000, no particular denomination 38,000, total 191,000.

rapidly growing population was intense and effort was unremitting; the Methodist saddle-bag preacher has, with good reason, become almost a symbol of the zeal of the period but his enthusiasm was catching, and by the middle of the decade even the Church of England was adapting itself to the Canadian scene by modifying its methods. The society of Upper Canada was at the moment in a fluid condition, as intelligent leaders both in church and state could see; and, when it set, the rewards would surely be to those who had earned them by energy and determination.

This diversity of religious groups was destined to be of great importance in the cultural development of the province, but the immediate implications of the situation were almost more important politically than culturally. Nowhere, was there a sharper conflict between British and American influences than in the field of religion, and added to this was the complicating element of that apple of discord, the clergy reserves. Had some evil genius attempted to produce a device calculated to bedevil every contentious issue in the province he could scarcely have done better than the clergy reserves. They touched economic questions in their relation to land, taxation, and roads; they complicated the thorny set of problems which centred around the question of education, and which would have been difficult enough in any case. They elicited a flood of arguments over the relative merits of the principle of state support of religion on the one hand which was damned by its opponents as a most potent means of devitalizing and enslaving true religion, and the voluntary principle on the other, which was damned by its opponents as an American device for promoting infidelity and materialism. The clergy reserves were probably the most bitter, certainly the most continuous, cause of dispute in the politics of the decade.

The political scene must, of necessity, be suggested even more briefly than the economic and religious. Here we have the spectacle, by no means an unfamiliar one in the story of British colonial America, of the dominance of a minority precariously maintained through a working alliance with the governors who followed each other through the little provincial cock-pit. The family compact, as it came to be known in the early '30's, was not so closely knit either in personnel or common interest as the name suggests, but it did nevertheless maintain a clearly discernible position of special privilege, economic and social, while politically it was powerful enough to maintain not only an undisputed monopoly of the executive and legislative councils but

also a majority or a very powerful opposition in the elected assembly. Political and constitutional practices and machinery thus lent strong aid to the conservative interests entrenched in Upper Canada in 1830.

But, it may be fairly asked at this point, was there anything really distinctive about the situation in Upper Canada in the early '30's? All the elements may, broadly speaking, be duplicated by looking at other English-speaking communities in North America, either in the 1830's or in a not very remote prior period. The effects of rapid growth, and much diversity in racial and religious groups, can, for example, be seen in the American states, and in particular in the new frontier states. Agrarian discontent, economic depression, and demands for an adequate system of public education were far from unknown elsewhere than in Upper Canada. As for religious establishment or special privilege, several of the American colonies had had it and in New England a shadow of it persisted to this very period. The attack on minority rule was even more common. The growing pains accompanying the early development of democracy were being felt with varying degrees of severity on both sides of the Atlantic—in the American states, in Nova Scotia and other British colonies, and even in the United Kingdom itself. What then, if anything, was unusual about the situation in Upper Canada? The answer is that perhaps no other American community had so many elements of difficulty concentrated with such intensity in a short period. Here, if anywhere, is to be found the unique quality in the Upper Canadian scene. Let me make one or two further suggestions with regard to it.

In the new western states which had the problems of a frontier society and rapidly growing population, the attack on special privilege was not on a class established within the state, but on the west as a section, against the east. The individual western state lacked, therefore, the turbulence resulting from serious internal class conflict. In the older eastern states where the struggle against minority privilege did appear during these years the issue was comparatively a simpler one than in Upper Canada, lacking, in particular, a complicating element as difficult as the clergy reserves and centring around such questions as the revision of the state constitution or the elimination of property qualifications for voting or holding office. Moreover, the conflict was not confined within a short space of time as in Upper Canada. The first stage of the battle had, in fact, in these states, been won in

the days of the American Revolution when extensive internal reform accompanied the struggle for independence. The conflicts following 1815 were, therefore, essentially rear-guard actions. The conservatives in the eastern states, in sharp contrast to those in Upper Canada, were also by implication put on the defensive by the philosophy of the Declaration of Independence, and the bills of rights in the various constitutions—a philosophy firmly embedded in the American mind and forming a common pattern for political thinking throughout the Union.

The family compact in Upper Canada was, on the other hand, certainly fighting no rear-guard action. We have been too much accustomed to think that by the 1820's the privileges, position, and personnel of the family compact were clearly defined and that reformers then began attacks on a system which was firmly established. The fact is that the period after 1815 was marked by the extension rather than the mere defence of special privilege. Various illustrations might be found, but the most important lay in the field of religious rivalry, and especially in the determined plans of the colony's ablest politician, the Reverend John Strachan. In spite of weaknesses in his own position, Strachan's aim was nothing less than to make the Church of England the most powerful influence in the political, religious, and cultural life of the province by insisting on the full recognition of the Church of England's priority and privilege at a time when opposition to exclusive privileges was rising even in England. From Strachan's point of view the privileges claimed were expressly stated or clearly implied in the Constitutional Act and in the example of English society. They had never been fully defined or enjoyed, but the fact that they had, to a great extent, lain dormant for thirty years or more was no argument against their validity. It was, on the contrary, the most compelling proof of the necessity of unremitting action. To transplant a system of ecclesiastical privilege at so late a date when all the tendencies of the American environment had for years been flooding in the opposite direction was an utter impossibility, but no suspicion of failure daunted Strachan. A greatly increased and amply endowed clergy, a carefully controlled university, and no less carefully controlled district school system extended in answer to the growing need for lower education, a dominating influence in the executive and legislative councils through friends and former pupils, a powerful pressure through Church of England influence on the colonial office and

parliament in England,⁵—these were the means which he felt could be, and which indeed in part, were, fitted together into a system of practical politics as cleverly conceived and tenaciously pursued as any in the history of colonial America. The measure of Strachan's ability is not his failure, but the record of his years of struggle and the indelible impression which he left on the province through the religious and educational institutions for whose growth he was chiefly responsible. It is little wonder that his aims and actions aroused extraordinary bitterness in the '30's. He did not have for so extreme a programme even the support of all members and adherents of the Church of England; as for his opponents, he differed from them utterly in his fundamental assumptions on the rights of the Church of England and the application of English precedents to the Canadian scene. In their eyes his action and policy were not defensive, but were defiantly aggressive attacks to create what they claimed the province had never had—an ecclesiastical domination. The religious struggle, and through it the whole struggle over minority rights and privileges in Upper Canada, was thus embittered by uncertainties. It was not the struggle of a new conception of society against one which had been accepted. It was a struggle between opposing groups, each trying desperately to fortify and defend a contention which had never been clearly established in the province.

At this point it is well to remember another and most important element in the Upper Canadian scene—the divisions in the so-called Reform party. This consideration has also been too much neglected in traditional views of the period although it is fundamental to an understanding of what happened. So divided were the opponents of the family compact after 1833 that it is almost a misnomer to speak of the Reform party. Of these divisions the split between Mackenzie and the Methodists⁶ was by all odds the most important example. Radical and reform groups have an unhappy way of falling out with one another but there is no more extreme example in the history of British colonial America than the bitter quarrel between Mackenzie, and the Methodists led by Egerton Ryerson. Up to 1833 the reform forces must have

⁵For an interesting early sidelight on Strachan's aims, see G. W. Spragge, "Dr. Strachan's motives for becoming a legislative councillor" (*CANADIAN HISTORICAL REVIEW*, XIX, Dec., 1938).

⁶The term Methodists as used in this paper refers to the largest Methodist group, which after the union with the British Wesleyan Methodists in 1833 was named "The Wesleyan Methodist Church in British North America." There were other Methodist groups, the largest being "The Methodist Episcopal Church of Canada" organized in 1834.

appeared to most of the rank and file fairly clearly united both in principle and action. When, therefore, Ryerson published, in October, 1833, the first of his "Impressions made by our late visit to England," with its bitter attack on Hume, who was Mackenzie's main support in the British parliament and was regarded as the chief representative of the reform cause of Upper Canada in the mother country, the shock came like a thunderbolt on the whole Reform party in the colony. The story has been told elsewhere⁷ and the details cannot be allowed to detain us, but from that moment until the rebellion the enmity between Conservatives and Reformers was if anything outmatched by the bitterness between Mackenzie and the Wesleyan Methodists. Ryerson did not reveal fully his reasons for precipitating the quarrel in 1833, but there can be little question as to his underlying motives. Hume was disliked and mistrusted by the Wesleyan connection in England, with whom the Methodists in Upper Canada had just united. In view of the rapidly rising immigration from England, as well as the recent association with the American Methodists which brought oft-repeated charges of disloyalty, the Methodists of Upper Canada had far more to gain than to lose by a clear break with so dubious an ally as Hume. Ryerson, like a number of other acute observers, believed that with the passing of the Reform Bill in England the tide was running irresistibly in the direction of a more liberal colonial policy, and he was convinced that the destiny of Canada lay with the solid men of liberal views who were rising to power in England. Nothing could be more certain—and Durham's contribution to the Canadian problem provides a striking proof of the correctness of the view—than that the cause of Canadian reform, if it ever was to succeed, had to rise above the level set for it in English public life by second-rate men like Hume and Roebuck. The splitting of the Reform party in 1833 is thus understandable on the basis of principle and broad considerations of public policy, even though all the implications may not have been clear at the moment. Among conservatives also there was by no means complete unity in policy and action, but the divisions in the Reform party were chiefly responsible for the complexity in the political scene which certainly, if one may judge by his description of the parties in Upper Canada, Lord Durham himself was far

⁷C. B. Sissons, *Egerton Ryerson: His life and letters*, I (Toronto, 1937); George W. Brown, "The early Methodist church and the Canadian point of view" (*Canadian Historical Association report*, 1938).

from understanding. In every period of crisis, the great body of those holding "middle-of-the-road" views are forced at last if the issue reaches an impasse, to choose between one or other of the extremes, not because they agree at all points with the allies forced on them by circumstance, but because their choice is the lesser of two evils. So it was in Upper Canada in the period just before and during the rebellion, and to this "middle-of-the-road" group must go the credit in the long run for saving the situation. When every just tribute has been paid to Mackenzie's broad human sympathies and his fearless disregard of his own personal interests in the cause which he believed right, it still remains true that he contributed little that was constructive to the solution of the Canadian problem. Among Canadian historical legends few die harder than that which suggests that Mackenzie and his followers alone stood for the cause of reform. A failure to understand and make clear the animosities within the reform movement is largely responsible for this misconception.

With acute divisions of opinion and with a faulty political and administrative system operating in the special interest of a minority, it is little wonder that some observers felt a spirit of frustration and bitterness pervading the province. Upper Canada, an "unhappy and mismanaged but most magnificent country," wrote Mrs. Jameson in describing the province just before the rebellion, "appeared to me loyal in spirit but resentful and repining under the sense of injury."⁸

There is among all parties a general tone of complaint and discontent, a mutual distrust, a languor and supineness, the cause of which I cannot, as yet, understand. Even those who are enthusiastically British . . . are as discontented as the rest.

Toronto is like a fourth or fifth-rate provincial town, with the pretensions of a capital city. We have here a petty colonial oligarchy, a self-constituted aristocracy, based upon nothing real nor upon anything imaginary, and we have all the mutual jealousy and fear and petty gossip, and mutual meddling and mean rivalry, which are common in a small society of which the members are well known to each other, a society composed, like all societies, of many heterogeneous particles, but as these circulate within very confined limits, there is no getting out of the way of what one most dislikes. . . . There reigns here a hateful, factious spirit in political matters, but, for the present, no public or patriotic feeling, no recognition of general or generous principles of policy; as yet I have met with none of these; Canada is a colony, not a country; it is not yet identified with the dearest affections and associations, remembrances and hopes of its inhabitants . . . but a few more generations must change all this.

⁸Mrs. Jameson's well-known book was reviewed in the *Christian guardian* of Feb. 13, 1839.

In her reference to Canada's colonial status, Mrs. Jameson unquestionably put her finger on another, and one of the most potent, causes of difficulty and complication in the Canadian scene. Upper Canada was not, of course, unique in this matter, but in no colony was the question of loyalty to the British connection ever used with a more unscrupulous disregard of the principles of fair play and good policy than it was in Upper Canada in the 1830's. For this the family compact and Tory elements must bear the chief burden of odium. They it was who in season and out tried to establish the contention that loyalty and the maintenance of their own special interests were one and the same thing. They were indeed more loyal than the British government itself, for while they pounced on any criticism of the British government or British institutions by their opponents as scarcely less than treasonable, they reserved to themselves the right of free criticism, and even of committing lawless acts in the name of law and order, burnt British ministers in effigy on occasion, and even seemed to suggest at times that the occupant of the throne itself was not wholly above suspicion. The history of the concept of loyalty would form one of the most important contributions to the story of the development of Canadian attitudes, for attempts to claim loyalty as the perquisite of a particular group or set of individuals and to deny equal privilege of opinion to others have been known even since the 1830's, and when that history comes to be written one important chapter at least will be given to Upper Canada one hundred years ago.

I remarked above that in Upper Canada there was no common political philosophy, or pattern of thought, such as was provided in the United States by well-known affirmations like those in the Declaration of Independence, the bills of rights, and Washington's Farewell Address. In one sense this generalization requires qualification for the practices of British parliamentary government, the principles of British constitutional liberty, and the examples of British institutions formed a political creed to which everybody at one time or another gave at least lip service. But what were these practices, principles, and examples? With England herself going through a political revolution the solid rock of British precedents became nothing more than shifting sand. The problem of deciding what were British sentiments and British actions was, of course, simple for some. Sir Allan McNab, or a Church of England rector, for example, needed to do nothing more than be themselves. For others, the question was not so

easy. Ryerson, for instance, and no one not even Mackenzie wrote more voluminously on the politics of the decade, wrestled with the problem of loyalty over and over again. He was concerned not merely with Canada's relation to the United Kingdom, but with the whole problem of the obligations of the citizen to both religion and the state, and with the constitutional rights of the British subject to freedom of speech and action. In his first editorial, his editorial of October 8, 1831, his signed statement on Christian loyalty in May, 1838, and on numerous other critical occasions, he came back to the problem, citing references and opinions from Locke, Blackstone, Paley, Adam Clark, Richard Watson, John Wesley, and others. Copious extracts from these writers seem like pretty strong meat for newspaper readers, but apparently subscribers to the *Christian guardian* could "take it" — in any case, they got it. That his authorities were almost exclusively British is a point of significance, for although it was tactically wise for him not to go to others he would probably not have done so in any case, and he had a powerful influence in shaping the tendencies of political thought in the province.

Nor can we afford in this connection to forget the trivialities. When Peter Jones, the famous Indian preacher, told an Upper Canadian missionary meeting how he had met the young queen and how graciously she had received him, and was greeted, as the report puts it, by deafening applause, it is quite clear that certain attitudes and emotions were being firmly embedded in the Upper Canadian mentality. Whether or not these processes of political education were the most desirable ones is beside the point. They went on just the same and with far-reaching results, for north of the lakes there were being created patterns of political thinking different from those of either England or the United States. Perhaps they could not have been developed without the protecting influence of the British connection but that again is beside the point in this paper. The fact was that patterns of thought were being formed. They were the Canadian amalgam of influences from both sides of the Atlantic and they are among the fundamental elements in the Canadian point of view to our own day.

Of all the complications rooted in the imperial connection none was more productive of animosity than the interminable process of appeal to England for the support of contending opinions, or for the settlement of thorny problems. The necessity of appeal to a distant third party is, of course, inseparable from any colonial

system, but for Upper Canada the importance of these appeals was greatly increased by the even balance of forces in the province. Had the third party been his majesty's government, one and indivisible, the situation would have been much simpler. As it was in the 1830's, however, any colonial leader, displeased with the British government could console himself with the hope that his majesty's ministers might be replaced tomorrow by men of sounder, that is of more agreeable, views. And meanwhile there was the possibility of influencing members of parliament or individuals and groups of special importance. So we see an unending procession of pushful individuals and bulging mail-bags trooping back and forth across the Atlantic—Strachan with his bishops and S.P.G.; Mackenzie with Hume and his Radicals; Ryerson with his new-found friends among the Evangelicals, both clerical and mercantile; Baldwin as always with a touch of aloof respectability seeing the right people; the governors and their staffs, and many others of lesser note, all enveloped in a kind of blizzard of innumerable official dispatches and private letters. Little wonder that decisions were delayed, hope was deferred when sometimes it should have been killed, lost causes were prolonged, and a resort to violence in the end was encouraged. This is not to argue that the imperial connection should not have been there. To do so is as futile as to assert that a sick man should be well or a short one tall. Neither should it be implied that an enumeration of the difficulties inherent in the imperial connection should be allowed to pass as a fair estimate of it. But the fact remains that the problems of administration and the tangled concepts of loyalty which were involved in them provided one of the most serious elements in the complications of the Canadian scene.

Into this situation of divided interests and conflicting aims there was already creeping in the early '30's a spirit of violence that boded ill for the future. Elections were marked by ugly incidents of mob action, and the expulsions of Mackenzie from the legislature showed that essentially lawless attitudes utterly incompatible with the principles of British parliamentary government were actuating men who occupied positions of responsibility and should have known better. The Tories, who later heaped on Mackenzie all the odium of rebellion took an equal, if not indeed a major share, in initiating the appeal to violence. Men of moderate views, both conservative and liberal, many of them deeply convinced of the need of change, were profoundly alarmed. There

was perhaps less open evidence of turbulence in the months immediately preceding the rebellion, but this was merely the calm before the storm.

So, with the elements of political, religious, and economic conflict balancing and counter-balancing uncertainly against each other, with an attitude of narrow inflexibility in high Tory circles, with a Reform party hopelessly divided and with a governor whose genius in doing the wrong thing has been so often described that it needs no mention here, Upper Canada drifted into the rebellion. Traditional views seem often to have suggested that the rebellion was a complication following a situation which up to that time had been the comparatively simple one of a struggle between reform and reaction. The truth is almost exactly the reverse. The outbreak of war always temporarily simplifies the issue and the rebellion cut like a knife through the confusion which had preceded it. Governor Head armed to the teeth and chasing a rather pathetic rag-tag army of farmers up Yonge street may seem to us to have about him an irresistible touch of comic opera, but there was no such feeling in 1837. For the moment and for the first time since peace in 1815 had ended a three years' struggle against invasion and conquest, there seemed to be only one issue in Upper Canada and only two sides between which to choose. The rebellion, however, settled none of the points of real conflict. The apparent clarifying of the issue was a deception and in this respect the only unusual thing about the crisis was the speed with which people woke up to that fact. The aftermath, like the conditions which preceded Head's dishonest and short-lived triumph, are therefore the points of real interest for this paper, and in the aftermath the dominant and alarming tendency was the drift once more towards confusion and strife with the old complex lines of contention changed less than one might imagine, but with the spirit of bitterness immeasurably increased. By January, 1839, on the eve of the publication of Durham's *Report* this process of degeneration was rapidly approaching the point of an impasse, if anything more serious than that which it had reached in 1837. The development of this disheartening condition cannot, of course, be examined here in detail, but its chief reasons may be suggested. They were, in addition to the effects of serious economic depression at least three in number: the reassertion of the principles and claims of the family compact and the re-emergence of opposition to them led this time not by the extremists who had gone into rebellion, but by men who had loyally supported

the government; the atmosphere of violence created by measures of repression, by sporadic acts of lawlessness committed by desperate enemies of the government, and by the threat of foreign invasion; and finally, the questioning and uncertainty throughout the province as to what the policy of the British government was to be.

The strife between reform and conservative elements made its re-emergence in confused if unmistakable fashion almost immediately. Head's egotism and vindictiveness in his hour of victory gave pause even to some of his conservative supporters. Within a few weeks he had lost the confidence of the great mass of moderate Reformers who had rallied around him. His recall came by March, but it made little difference, and by early spring the treason trials and executions had thrown a pall over the province. Tory papers were urging the death or deportation of everyone prominent in the rebellion; counter-revolution was in full swing and thousands were planning to leave the province.⁹ Any questioning of this policy of reaction to which the governor lent at least his passive support might be made the basis of a charge of disloyalty. With reckless self-confidence the Tories were prepared to repudiate those middle-of-the-road Reformers whose numbers and loyalty had alone made Mackenzie's defeat possible. By May, Ryerson, the most notable victim of this outrageously short-sighted ingratitude, was being called a sneaking Jesuit and a rebel.

To find a focus for the sense of bitter disillusionment, the latent resentment, spreading through the province was not easy. As before the rebellion no one issue was broad enough to unite all the reform elements, but as one might have predicted the issue of the clergy reserves and the fifty-seven rectories came nearest to it and the Tories themselves were responsible for initiating once more the bitter strife over religious privilege. The time seemed ripe at last for the settlement of the question to the advantage of the Church of England. The method was made clear in February, when the proposal was made that the provincial legislature re-invest the lands in the crown. This would remove the question from the province where, even in the period of reaction the issue would be in doubt, to the British parliament where it was expected that heavy pressure could be exerted by Tory influence. There were evidences of great activity behind the

⁹A. S. Longley, "Emigration and the crisis of 1837 in Upper Canada" (*CANADIAN HISTORICAL REVIEW*, XVII, March, 1936).

scenes—the preparation of petitions in England and Canada, and the influence of the bishops in the house of lords, urging the protection of what was termed the established church in Upper Canada. The proposal for re-investment was cleverly designed to win for the Church of England all and perhaps more than it could hope for in any other way, while on the surface it had an appearance of impartiality which was almost certain to divide the opposition to Church of England claims. This in fact is precisely what it did, especially in the Presbyterian and Wesleyan Methodist churches. Leaders in the Methodist church viewed the situation with growing alarm. They felt themselves tied hand and foot by the certainty of charges of disloyalty, if they raised any question against official policy; and it appeared that a struggle which had been carried on by Reformers for years might be settled against them in the end without even a battle. The only hope was to get Ryerson back into the *Guardian* as editor, and to re-open the warfare of controversy whatever the consequences. A minority of conservative, and especially of English, elements in the Methodist conference, were against it but they were over-ridden. On May 9 the *Guardian* published a slashing letter from Ryerson on Christian loyalty defending the right of the citizen to free speech and constitutional opposition to government. It was the opening gun in a campaign that soon broadened through the province far beyond Methodist ranks and went on for months. In May also under the quickly penetrated disguise of United Empire Loyalist came Ryerson's courageous denunciation of Bidwell's expulsion from the province by Head. By June Ryerson was back in the *Guardian*, denouncing both Mackenzie and Head and trying as before the rebellion to hold the difficult middle ground of loyalty and moderate reform. In issue after issue he fought the assertion that the church establishment was the truest bulwark against rebellion, American radical democracy, and other bogeys which Tory papers like the *Church* and the *Cobourg Star* were describing to their readers. In September he began his "Letters to Draper," which ran for weeks in a detailed argument of every aspect of the clergy reserves question.

It must not, however, be thought from these references to Ryerson that the Methodists alone agitated the question. The *Guardian* had strong allies in the press of the province. Other religious groups gave some support to the Church of England but for the most part they were overwhelmingly in opposition. By January of 1839 the province was torn with dissension over the

clergy reserves question as bitterly as it had ever been and both sides were dangerously near the encouragement of violent measures. Petitions and counter-petitions were being circulated and intimidation of individuals was being reported. The continued suspension of the Habeas Corpus Act still raised the question as to the legality of free discussion and the Church of England organ, the *Church*, charged its opponents with "fanning the flame of political excitement, undermining the principles of subordination, and seeking to confound all distinction and all order in the general calamity of revolution and anarchy." "The high principled, the religious, the Conservative people of England will soon testify that their transatlantic fellow-subjects and fellow Christians are not to be recklessly abandoned either to bandits and plunderers on the one hand, or to *Anabaptists* and *Infidels* on the other."

"This raising the torch of discord will have fatal consequences," declared Hincks's *Examiner*, condemning the Tory policy of reaction, and in a long editorial in the first issue of January, 1839, Ryerson drew a parallel between the situation in Upper Canada and the attempt of Charles I just two hundred years before to force an alien ecclesiastical system on the people of Scotland. The famous Covenant, he pointed out, had been maintained at the point of the sword. "It is avowed as a principle of Scotch Presbyterianism" he wrote, quoting the *Presbyterian christian examiner*, "to employ the sword in the defence of the rights of conscience, as well as in the defence of the principles of constitutional liberty."

In every contest which has ever taken place between tyranny and civil liberty, ecclesiastical state officers have been invariably, with some rare exceptions, arrayed on the side of despotism. Thus it was in the reign of Charles I—thus it is at this day. When public opinion is too strong to admit of the establishment and maintenance, in the ordinary exercise of Executive influence, of such an ecclesiastical regime, then either a military is called in to its aid—as has long been the case in Ireland— . . . or, the whole hierarchy and civil power are resisted and overthrown, as was the case in Scotland; and, as it has been predicted these ten years will be the case in Canada.

The province was in fact, on the eve of the reception of Lord Durham's *Report*, as nearly in a state of deadlock over the religious issue as it could be. This was the chief focus for the struggle between reform and reaction and yet it was not, as I have suggested, a broad enough issue to rally around it all the forces for reform latent in the province. The balance was so even that an explosion, or at least a prolonged and bitter struggle, seemed inevitable.

During this time news and rumours of violence, bloodshed, and invasion from the United States were flying thick about the province. We have been too much inclined to overlook the fact that the outbreak in December of '37 was only one of a series of risings, conspiracies, and lawless acts which kept the public mind of the province in a state of war-time alarm for months. The more closely one examines local history the clearer it becomes that during the whole rebellion period large parts of the province were seething with discontent and apprehension and that each area had its own special causes of disturbance, all of which merge into the general picture. The risings near London and in the Shorthills district, the destruction of the *Caroline*, the burning of the *Sir Robert Peel*, the invasion at Prescott, the plots of Hunters' Lodges in New York, Ohio, and Michigan, the piratical career of the schooner *Ann* which was loaded with arms, apparently taken with official connivance out of an arsenal in Detroit, and which went up and down the Canadian shore firing pot-shots at Amherstburg until she was boarded by the loyal militia of Essex and Kent, who had rushed in to save the situation and for whom the ladies of the district immediately began embroidering flags—all these may look like petty episodes in our age of really effective destruction, but they were not petty episodes in 1838-9. Texas, it was argued, had just been taken away from Mexico by methods which respectable people even in the United States denounced, and events seemed to point at Canada as the next victim. Reformer and conservative alike rallied to the support of the government in repelling invasion, and putting down lawlessness. But the Tories as usual tried to turn the loyalty argument to their own advantage. Reform leaders were said to be plotting with the rebels in the United States. Radical reform democracy and all the evils of mob rule, according to papers like the *Patriot*, were threatening the peace of the world and it was clear that Canada stood, fortunately with the British navy behind her, in the very path of the monster. The red menace of American democracy must be crushed:¹⁰

Let British Capitalists pause ere they slumber in the security of imagined wealth, invested in the chaotic abyss of MOB LAW. A long and dreary night of Egyptian darkness is coming over the Institutions of the United States. . . . Be assured our worthy countrymen that "*American Securities*" ARE NO SECURITIES AT ALL. Will England suffer herself to be cheated out of the Canadas as Mexico was bullied out of Texas. . . . We guess not.

¹⁰These extracts from the *Toronto Patriot* are taken from various issues between Jan. 5 and April 3, 1838.

As for compensation for the *Caroline*, a stout-hearted correspondent wrote, "I'd see the Yankees hanged first! I'd see every mother's son of them hanged as high as Haman first! I'd plumply tell them that."

WAR IS INEVITABLE: and Heaven forgive us! if we say wrong in saying that IT IS ABSOLUTELY NECESSARY TO THE FUTURE PEACE OF THE WORLD. . . . War is one of the greatest evils which "flesh is heir to," but we consider it as wanting much of being the greatest evil, which horrid eminence we give to mob rule, or, as the "*starving thousands*" of *sovereigns* would say, to "PURE DEMOCRACY." To this Hydra must all the nations of the Earth bow, if Great Britain be not strong enough to lay it prostrate. We have therefore but the choice of two evils, WAR or SUBJUGATION TO THE MOB; what man of sense will not choose the *least*?

The 11th, 72d, 81st, and 93d Regiments are all coming out immediately, besides others from the West Indies. They are all coming in ships of war. We shall lack neither armies nor navies to inflict ample vengeance for any insults or injuries we may sustain from any quarter whatever. . . . By this time all necessary information is at home, and we hope Joseph Hume has been seized as a traitor.

Emotions were in fact too strong for mere prose, as some extracts from the *Patriot's* column headed "Original Poetry" will make painfully clear:

Canadians lo! a pirate bark
Her blood stain'd banner waves,
The ruthless spoiler stalks from forth
Yon Godless land of slaves.
Brothers again the bugle horn
Pours forth its startling glee—
Again we rally round our Queen
Fair Lady of the Sea.

Again the hour of peril comes—
The booming gun is heard,
The star of glory lights us on,
Victoria is the word.
We wear no chains but those of love,
The fetters of the free—
Hurra! for Britain's Queen of Hearts—
Fair Lady of the Sea.

Now Uncle Jonathan be wise,
And of yourself take care, Sir,
For each Canadian loudly cries,
Invade us if you dare, Sir.

Our flag has braved a thousand years,
The breeze and battle too, Sir,
It conquered on Trafalgar's wave
And plains of Waterloo, Sir.

No slave shall ever breathe our air,
 No Lynch laws e'er shall bind us;
 So keep your Yankee mobs at home,
 For Britons still you'll find us.

Yet foes are around thee, Fair Maid of the Ocean!
 The Eagle's broad pinions expand;—
 Like a bird of ill omen, it aids the commotion
 Of Billows, that break on our strand.

Yes, attitudes were being formed in Upper Canada in the 1830's, and, in spite of changes, they still have here and there a startlingly familiar look.

Behind these exaggerated outbursts lay a wide-spread sense of bitterness, frustration, and hopelessness, and to this the questioning as to British policy added all that it could of complication and embarrassment. For a short time Durham's appointment and work in Canada appeared to offer a clue to the future, but Durham himself, as Professor New has so admirably shown, was deeply entangled in British politics and the uncertainties of his position were well known. Reformers of all groups naturally had hailed his appointment with enthusiasm and supported him loyally. His policy, they declared, would mean public improvements, revived prosperity, and reform. The Tories showed at first some hesitation to criticize the queen's representative but this soon wore off and with the announcement of Durham's policy of pardon their inhibitions completely disappeared.

Whatever the Tories may have lost, [declared the *Patriot*, August 31, 1838], it is plain THEY HAVE NOT LOST THEIR HONOUR. We wish England may be able to say as much when she loses her North American Colonies. . . . We should be glad if Her Majesty would be graciously pleased to send some of her steam-ships to convey away her friends that they may at least be out of the reach of the rifles, daggers, and bowie-knives of the murderous lurking dogs that are turned loose upon them. . . . Indeed every horrid villain that has best helped to stain and pollute with deadliest crime our little historic page is SAFE.—Safe quotha—ay HONORED. . . . All we call for now is plenty of steam-ships to carry away the friends of Queen Victoria and of her toppling Crown to some *terra incognita*, whence, when Melbourne and Glenelg are thrown upon the shelf, they may be brought back to resuscitate her honor, re-fix her topsy-turvy throne, put a strait-jacket on Mercy-run-mad, reconstruct the defences of England's chief outwork, drive back the Yankee revolutionary Jacobins, re-establish order, maintain the last refuge of civil and religious liberty, and perpetuate the renown of the British Empire.

The circumstances of Durham's departure added to the feelings of confidence on the one side and the fears of defeat on the other, and brought a dangerous flare-up of animosities. The Tory press

was jubilant and members of the British Whig ministry were burned in effigy in Toronto. Durham's arrival in England and his treatment by friend and foe were followed in detail, each party trying to read into the story what assurance it could. The *Church* quoted *The Times* epithet, "The Lord High Seditious," and predicted Durham's ruin. "This arrogant and shallow nobleman will only be remembered by future generations in Canada for the mischief he has done."

All this bitterness, uncertainty, and confusion of thought was at its height when Durham's *Report* was on the high seas one hundred years ago. It reached Upper Canada, as it did the English public, through the press. A London newspaper via New York was handed immediately on its arrival in Toronto to Ryerson by a friend, and on April 6, just over two months after the *Report* had been signed, the *Christian guardian* scored a "hot scoop" by presenting to its readers the first extracts under the heading, "Late and Important News from London." They were, it is perhaps needless to remark, on Governor Head, the treatment of the reformers since the rebellion, and the clergy reserves.

For simple elegance of style [wrote Ryerson], clearness of statement, lucidness of exposition, cogency of argument, and comprehensiveness of investigation, this *Report* far exceeds any document of the kind that we ever read. It will form a new era in British Colonial government, and will doubtless become a text book of colonial polity both at home and throughout these provinces, if not in all the dependencies of Great Britain. It is all that the most enthusiastic friend of the Canadas could desire, and more than we had ventured to anticipate. . . .

What had happened was clear—the issue had at last arrived on which every Reformer in the province could be united. What the clergy reserves, the grievances over land and education, the conflicts about loyalty, and all the other issues over which Reformers and Tories had argued at cross-purposes for years had been unable to do, the *Report* did at one stroke. Like the rebellion it cut for the moment through confusion and uncertainty and forced men to take sides on what seemed like a clear question.

Tribute has been paid to Baldwin and rightly so, for his priority in urging responsible government and to Durham for his magnificent contribution in making Canadian reform an issue of high public policy in both Britain and Canada, but too little attention has been given to the rank and file of reform groups who with their leaders had been fighting in the trenches of bitter controversy for years, each defending its own little segment and sometimes firing at other Reformers as furiously as at opponents. Their united support was now as decisive as it had been two years

before. They had shown that without their aid rebellion could not be forced successfully on the province in '37. And it was equally clear that without them reform could not have been carried in the province in '39, even had the English government desired to make the attempt.

As fast as the means of communication could accomplish it, the issue was placed before the province. In the assembly, a motion commending the *Report* was lost, 12-23, and a detailed attack on the *Report* was drawn up by Attorney-General Hagerman. Was not the *Report*, he asked in the house,

repugnant to the feelings of the people of this Province, and particularly to every loyal man who was determined to see our connection with the parent State cemented. Were they to say that the members of this house were elected by corruption? If the matter in his Lordship's Report was correct, they were. . . . No man who had a spark of honor within his breast, but would declare that the charges relating to the late election, as contained in the Report, were as false and as slanderous as the Report itself. . . . If his Lordship's Report were true, then he would say that this was a country in which no honest man could reside,—a country in which no emigrant would settle. Was it true, what his Lordship said, that the people of Upper Canada were mean and despicable; that they lived in log huts; that the members of this house were returned by the corrupt influence of the Government. No; no man would say it was true; and the house, instead of sanctioning such falsehoods, ought to shudder at the bare contemplation of them. . . . The Report did not contain ten lines of truth. With regard to the responsible government, if it were to be conducted in the way proposed by his Lordship, what kind of justice could they expect? He viewed the Report as a deliberate and sweeping denunciation against every man in the country [Debate of April 11 as reported in the *Christian guardian* of May 15, 1839].

Within a month the papers throughout the province were clearly taking sides:¹¹

The general test [the *British colonist* declared of the next election], will be the principles laid down in Lord Durham's Report. . . . The tide has already flown so much in favor of the Report, that no effort, no matter by whom made, will induce the people to relinquish the idea of supporting it.

Lord Durham's plan [said the *Kingston Upper Canada herald*], is *English*, and directly tends to raise a nation of equal and prosperous freemen; the plan of his opponents is *Russian*, and directly tends to produce a few arrogant, insufferable nobles, and a multitude of wretched, insulted slaves. People of Upper Canada, which do you choose?

Lord Durham's report [wrote Ryerson, in the *Guardian* of July 17], forms a rallying point for hitherto differing parties—a centre of attraction for the collection and adhesion of scattered and otherwise uncongenial particles. . . . Divisions and party spirit have been the bane of the province—are the source of our weakness,

¹¹The quotations from provincial papers on this and the following pages are taken from issues of the *Christian guardian* between May 29 and Aug. 21, 1839. The *Guardian* for many months printed a valuable column of press opinions from papers of varying views.

and the prelude of greater evils if not arrested. Lord Durham's report presents a British constitutional monarchy, even in a colony, in an aspect so inviting as to captivate the affections of the dissatisfied republican—to revive the desponding hopes of the loyalist (whether merchant, farmer or tradesman, whose business has declined and property depreciated fifty or an hundred per cent in value under the present withering system)—to lower the tone of the "irresponsible" and tyrannical incumbent of office, and humble the pretensions of the haughty aristocrat, and restore confidence to the community at large . . . thus producing, in a few short months, an unanimity of opinion and feeling to a greater extent throughout the province than has existed for many years, or than now exists either in England or in the United States on any great public question. Such was the avowed intention and such are the effects of Lord Durham's lucid expositions and irresistible reasoning.

By June the Durham meetings were beginning and they continued up to the arrival of Poulett Thomson early in November. The Reformers began to plan for organized demonstrations throughout the province in order to stiffen support of Durham's policy in England.

Lord Durham has done his part . . . [urged the *Hamilton Journal*]. It is the active support of the people of Upper Canada which is now required, to enable the ministry to act. On the one side of the minister's table is Lord Durham's report—on the other, are the impudent documents, said to be the Reports of the Legislative Council and House of Assembly—in front, *sits His Honour the Chief Justice*—and see, there enters, with pompous stride, *the new made Bishop*; the mitre is lowred and, with well directed bows, the *Ex-Archdeacon* takes his seat—these are the Representatives of the "compact system"! WHO REPRESENTS THE PEOPLE? *Who?* an echo answers WHO! People of Upper Canada! represent yourselves . . . rally in support of your principles, . . . assure the Imperial Government that you are ready to accept in sincerity and faithfulness a British Government, on British principles. . . .

Tory extremists displayed no less violent emotion. The *Church* warned that carrying out Durham's recommendations on responsible government "cannot but end in Rebellion." The "Durham flag," with the words "Lord Durham" on one side and "4th of July" on the other was being hoisted, it was rumoured, at reform meetings. Sheriffs in some places tried to deny the right of assembly, and in other cases men, even in official position, participated in violent measures to break up reform demonstrations. The *Cobourg Star*, whose editor was a captain of militia and a magistrate, wrote with regard to the Cobourg meeting which was broken up and ended in a riot:

Should any more of these *Durham* flags be hoisted in any other quarter of the Province,—we trust there are British arms enough to level them to the ground and to drive the rebels from the field. Men may talk as they please about constitutional rights and the liberty of the subject, and say it is better to treat such demonstrations of disloyalty with silent contempt. We hold a different opinion. . . . It is the duty of the Sheriff, with the *posse comitatus* of the District, to put down these

Durham meetings: and even the people themselves to do so without any warrant from the authorities—for rebellion must not be allowed to show itself unresisted for a moment.

Governor Arthur, who was in a difficult position, adopted the anomalous policy of deploring agitation while at the same time leaving unpunished those who committed lawless acts in the name of the preservation of order and established institutions. By autumn the situation was rapidly getting out of hand and in fact the most disgraceful scene of violence, resulting in the death of one and the injury of a number, was a meeting just outside Toronto on the eve of Thomson's arrival. The tide was, however, swinging definitely in favour of reform during the summer and autumn.¹² In October the *Christian guardian* published a list of newspapers showing sixteen for the *Report*, ten against, and four as yet undecided. Except in the period of rebellion so clear cut a division of opinion was unprecedented.

During these months the words "responsible government" became a battle cry. "How ridiculous," some cynic may be tempted to remark, "nobody knew its meaning." Of course not. The full implications of a revolution can never be known at the moment but the central point was clear enough in 1839 for any voter in the province. Durham's recommendations meant a liberalizing of colonial policy and an end of family compact domination within the colony. Exactly what they meant beyond that the future would determine. Newspaper editors, who always seem to feel under some necessity of appearing omniscient, explained "Responsible Government" of course with a great show of precision. To the Peterboro *Backwoodsman*, for example, the thing was as plain as a pike staff:

The Ultra Tories advocate the "Canadian" constitution as trumped up, explained, perverted, and executed by themselves with all the arbitrary tyranny and Star Chamber power which characterized the house of Stuart and government of England previous to the Revolution [of 1688], while the friends of Responsible Government advocate the "British" Constitution, taking for their basis the people's interest as declared in the Bill of Rights and secured by the act of settlement.

English constitutional history became in fact for a moment a most popular subject. The Toronto *Examiner* affirmed that

Before the Revolution of 1688, . . . the country [England] was almost constantly in a state of anarchy, with little if any security either for life or property. . . . Since the revolution, the government has been worked in perfect harmony, and there have been few instances of impeachment, none of the execution of ministers. To what is this different state of things to be ascribed? We answer,—since the

¹²One of the most interesting and significant decisions was that of the Grand Lodge of the Orange Order of British North America which at its annual meeting in July voted unanimously for responsible government.

revolution the Crown has selected advisers acceptable to the representatives of the people.

Tory papers tried to embarrass Reformers by demanding that they be explicit. How, asked the *Quebec Gazette*, could Egerton Ryerson explain his support of responsible government now and his opposition to it only three years earlier? It was obvious that the *Quebec Gazette* did not know either responsible government or Ryerson, for he rounded that corner, if one may use the vernacular, on two wheels and without turning a hair. In fact, he really did better than that for he proved that there was no corner at all and never had been one. American and radical examples, he declared, he had always abhorred and that his record proved it, but

We never did oppose the "responsible government" we now advocate. . . . What does his Lordship propose then? Lord Durham, except in the case of the union of the Canadas, proposes not the alteration of a single letter of the established Constitution; he proposes nothing more or less than that the people of Upper Canada, within the defined and secure limits of local legislation and government, should be governed, as in England, by the *men*, as well as *institutions*, of their choice. Hence, the *Quebec Gazette*, and all others whom it may concern, will not find it difficult to understand how the Editor of the *Guardian* and thousands of the staunchest constitutionalists in Upper Canada could oppose the "responsible government" of Mackenzie, Papineau, and their associates, in 1835 and 1836, and can, without any change of political principles, advocate Lord Durham's "responsible government" of 1839 [*Christian guardian*, June 5, 1839].

Thus, when Poulett Thomson came to Upper Canada in November of 1839, the ranks of Reformers were closed as they had not been in the history of the province, certainly as they had not been since 1832. To the usual welcoming addresses presented along the way, some of which made pointed references to responsible government, Thomson gave appreciative but vague replies. "We learn," said the Tory *Patriot* of Toronto "that the Responsibilities, headed by Messrs. Hincks and company, are already in ecstasies at what they call the promising tone of His Excellency's reply to the Corporation Address. For our part we see nothing in the reply calculated to alarm the Conservative public." The Reformers were on the whole confident. Thomson's close relations with Durham were well known as were his knowledge of commerce and his advocacy of the civil and religious privileges of dissenting groups in England. Some misgivings there were. Union with Lower Canada was an unwelcome necessity which promised no great good to the reform cause and Thomson himself was an unknown quantity.¹³ But the Reformers of Upper Canada had

¹³A lengthy discussion of Poulett Thomson and his views was quoted from the London *Colonial gazette* by the *Christian guardian* of Oct. 16, 1839. "Wise purposes may be acquired from others; decision of purpose is an inherent quality. In that quality poor Pow is known to be most deficient."

staked their all on the *Report*, and the new governor was its embodiment. The Montreal *Courier* had remarked that it understood "the Thomsonian resolutions were bolted by the Special Commissioners [of Lower Canada] as a boa-constrictor swallows a deer,—hair, horns, and all. That's as it ought to be;—there is no use in making two bites of a cherry." The Reformers of Upper Canada were prepared to act in the same spirit, and as the event proved their confident expectation of an alliance with the governor was not misplaced. Thomson in implementing Durham's *Report* needed the great body of those who favoured moderate reform throughout the province no less than they needed him, and when the legislature met this became clear:

The position of the parties [wrote Ryerson in the *Guardian* of December 18, 1839], is novel, and somewhat amusing. Messrs. Merritt, Aikman, Thorburn, Parke, &c., headed by the Solicitor General are the Government party; and Messrs. G. S. Boulton, Ruttan, Murney, Gamble, Cartwright, &c., are in opposition—making frequent attacks upon Her Majesty's Government and the Governor General; and some of them hinting strongly about separation from the Mother Country being better than such a policy of government. The Governor General is both hated and feared by members of the ultra church party. The Despatch of Lord John Russell on the Tenure of Public Offices, and the presence of the Governor General, have produced some of the best effects of "responsible government" in the tone and spirit of the debates.

What if Thomson, or should we now call him Sydenham, did, to use a phrase once applied to Mr. Asquith, envelope "responsible government" in a "lucid fog"? Some will say that is a mark of statesmanship. In any case the significant point was that the alignment of parties now gave visible proof that in effect a revolution had taken place.

It was, then, not the rebellion which marked the end of one chapter and the beginning of another. The rebellion determined only that Upper Canada would not tolerate reform through violence and separation from Britain. The end of the chapter was to be found in Sydenham's accomplishment during his first months in Canada. His success, like the passing of the Reform Bill in Britain and the election of Andrew Jackson in the United States, marked the acceptance in principle of the democratic revolution. To Elgin, Peel, Lincoln, and a multitude of lesser men there remained the challenge of wrestling with democracy's meaning and baffling problems.

GEORGE W. BROWN

The University of Toronto.

NOVA SCOTIA AND THE DURHAM MISSION

IN view of the special circumstances in Lower Canada that led directly to the appointment of a special commissioner and indirectly to his preoccupation with the Canadian problem, it might be inferred that Nova Scotia and the other Maritime Provinces had little more than an academic interest in Lord Durham's mission. In view also of the special circumstances that led to his resignation and hurried departure from Canada before he had time to discuss at any length the special problems of the Maritime Provinces with their delegates, it might be inferred that his conclusions would be superficial and that his recommendations would have little influence upon their future development. Such inferences, however, are not entirely justified, though both sets of circumstances diminished his influence upon Nova Scotia. A careful examination of contemporary newspapers and of debates in both houses of the legislature shows that Nova Scotians in particular followed with great interest every detail of his career from the date of his appointment to the date of his death and discussed with discernment the possibilities of his mission, the range of his powers, the magnitude of his problems, the handicaps under which he laboured, and the wisdom or folly of his recommendations. Generally speaking, although the tone of these discussions was more moderate in Nova Scotia than in the Canadas, similar divisions of opinion appeared: while the Tories sympathized with their fellow-placemen elsewhere, the Reformers expected much from his investigations and hailed his main recommendations with delight. But, despite this profound interest of Nova Scotians in Durham's mission and *Report*, it cannot be maintained that his influence was as great upon the evolution of self-government in Nova Scotia as in the Canadas, or that Nova Scotians would not have solved their own problems in a similar way if Lord Durham had not been sent on his special mission. Indeed, it would be as easy to maintain the thesis that the special circumstances which brought Lord Durham to Canada had more influence in retarding the evolution of self-government in Nova Scotia than his famous *Report* had in stimulating it. Be that as it may, I shall attempt in this lecture merely to illustrate and account for the attitude of the different parties or factions in Nova Scotia towards his work in the Canadas and to discuss how far his general recommendations were new to Nova Scotians or applicable to their problems. When this is done we shall be in a better position to estimate the signifi-

cance of Lord Durham's mission so far as Nova Scotia is concerned.

The struggle for responsible government in Nova Scotia may be regarded as a struggle against monopoly and privilege in church and state thus involving both imperial policy and local interests. It began with social and economic problems before it attempted to change the constitution, and was preceded by a change in outlook which desired the substitution of religious equality for an established church and democracy for oligarchy—a movement that ran parallel to Jacksonian democracy in the United States, the reform movement in Great Britain, and republicanism in Europe. It found its chief sources in the politico-ecclesiastical radicalism of Pictou county represented by the *Colonial patriot* and the friends of Pictou Academy, and in the politico-social democracy of western Nova Scotia represented by the *Yarmouth herald* and Herbert Huntington. These two streams were merged by Joseph Howe in the capital of the province through the *Novascotian*, subsequent to 1830, and in the legislative assembly, subsequent to 1837. Through his legislative reviews, editorials, correspondence, and extracts from other papers, Howe educated himself and his readers in political theory and, in the assembly, he strove to consolidate a party that would insist upon the application of those principles to practical politics. Thus, almost a decade before Lord Durham's mission to the Canadas, the two sources of inspiration and power that would ultimately undermine and overthrow the citadel of monopoly and privilege in Nova Scotia had been tapped, the two streams had been united and under the skilful leadership of Howe, were moving steadily and with discernment against that citadel. Therefore it is not unreasonable to suppose that if rebellion had not broken out in the Canadas Nova Scotians would have been able to obtain the fullest measure of local responsible government almost a decade earlier than they finally obtained it: for the rebellions not only gave a new lease of life to the various family compacts in the colonies but they also caused the imperial government to withhold the boon of self-government from those in whom they hitherto had confidence, because they had lost faith in the others despite the clear-cut recommendations of Lord Durham, their lord high commissioner.

It is impossible in this lecture to illustrate all general statements but I must pause to show that the Reformers in Nova Scotia knew what they were doing before Lord Durham's *Report* had recapitulated their history and, also, that they were very much concerned about the course that the movement for reform was taking in the

Canadas, particularly Lower Canada, several years before the rebellion. Though Blanchard of the *Colonial patriot*, like some of the Reformers in the Canadas, seemed most akin to Radicals like Hume and Roebuck in Great Britain and deplored the lack of spirit in the Nova Scotian assembly, Howe, Huntington, Young, and the other Nova Scotian Reformers never lost faith in the essential justice of the British government and people, and they were more imperialistic in the true sense of that word than the British people themselves. But when Blanchard went to England in 1831, on behalf of Pictou Academy, he associated with Hume and other Radicals, and he returned to Nova Scotia with a very bitter feeling against the colonial office. His harrowing tale of shuffling waiting and incivility is an excellent illustration of Buller's *Mr. Mothercountry of the colonial office*, and he bitterly resented the attitude of the under-secretary, Mr. Hay, in particular. "This you see," he wrote, "is a sample of colonial management. The Trustees' petition is delayed a month to accommodate Judge Halliburton and I their agent am all but kicked out of the office for asking a question. A million and a quarter of rational beings in North America under control of a Mr. Hay. Not even a Lord to rule us!! Can you wonder that I am in a rage?" But Blanchard, though a local assemblyman, was representing a private body, who did not send their petition through the regular channels, and, moreover, were asking the imperial government to go over the heads of their own representatives in the province. This may account for, but hardly excuse, the treatment he received. On the other hand, Howe, Young, Huntington, and the other Nova Scotian Reformers sought redress of grievances through the regular official channels, did not seek the assistance of Hume and Roebuck, and consequently when they later had occasion to visit England officially or unofficially they were received with the utmost courtesy at the colonial office, while their loyalty to the empire as a whole and to British principles was accepted there at its face value.

In 1830 Howe had declared in the *Novascotian* that there did not exist within the wide range of the British Empire a people more proud of the name and more attached to the government of England than the people of Nova Scotia; and that the foundations of this loyalty were so deeply laid in the hearts of his countrymen that they could not be overturned by those petty contentions which might attend the improvements of the local government. Again, in the *Novascotian* in 1834, he wrote:

With every disposition to sympathize with the people of Canada on all occasions, and to cooperate with them in a thorough reformation of Colonial abuses, we really are at a loss to appreciate the value of all their newspaper declamation, or to estimate the ultra tone which characterizes all they say and do with reference to public men and measures. So boundless is the torrent of abuse by which the Press of Upper Canada is deluged, and so frequently are the landmarks of truth and reason swept away by the stream, that we often throw our files aside in despair, and wonder how either party expect to have their effusions read, or how they can hope to be believed. The journals of the Lower Province are of a higher class, but they sometimes puzzle us strangely. Those by the last mail abound in materials for mystification. Lord Aylmer recently visited Montreal, whereat the Editors of the *Minerve* and *Vindicator* put their papers in mourning; and assailed him with a torrent of abuse, compared to which, Sterne's version of the Excommunication curses is scarcely more unmeasured.

Now though we dare say that some neglect,—some ignorance, and some bad policy, may have distinguished Lord Aylmer's administration, we cannot conceive how he could have punished officers who have acted according to law, and were acquitted by the tribunals of the country,—or how he has deserved the appellation of Nero, for not keeping away a disease which has ravaged half the world—and for declining to advance money on his own responsibility when the Assembly left him without a sixpence, and refused to make good the sums he had already expended. Though these things may be perfectly well understood at home, people at a distance require some fairness, and candour, and moderation, to win their belief, and naturally grow suspicious of the best of causes, when the advocates appear devoid of all discretion.

In a letter to H. S. Chapman, 1835, Howe stated that, though he had no sympathy with the official faction of Lower Canada, he had become suspicious of the loyalty of Papineau and his friends when John Neilson withdrew his support, and that he doubted the political sagacity of the Reformers when he read the ninety-two resolutions. "I have rarely seen," he wrote, "a more unstatesmanlike and discreditable paper from any legislative body than were the famous ninety-two resolutions. I do not speak so much of their substance, as of their style, and of their being ninety-two of them. If you compare them with any of the resolutions of Charles the First's Parliament, when complaining of grievances, or with the resolutions of Congress, or of the old Colonial Assemblies, you will understand what I mean." In the same letter he expressed his distrust of Roebuck, whose scheme of union Lord Durham brought to Canada. "I may be mistaken," he wrote, "but I think that gentleman has got quite credit enough for all the talent and judgment he possesses; so far as we can decide at this distance, his recent displays, either in Parliament or the press, have earned him but few laurels."

But, despite his distrust of the motives and tactics of the Lower Canadian Reformers, Howe saw more clearly than Lord

Durham that the English party was both violent and unjust, and he refused to be stampeded, even after the rebellion, into accepting their interpretation of either the constitutional problem or the racial conflict. Though his letter to Chapman had been written in 1835, it was not until the rebellion had broken out that he published it in self-defence. As soon as the rebellion broke out loyal meetings were held throughout Nova Scotia and the family compact party through their newspaper, the *Halifax Times*, tried to discredit the Nova Scotian Reformers as secret sympathizers with the rebels. At the first of these meetings in Halifax, Howe read this letter and henceforth Reformers as well as Tories vied with one another in public expression of their loyalty. But when the Constitutional Association of Montreal appealed to the speakers of the assemblies in the Maritime Provinces, in an endeavour to elicit an expression of opinion in their favour, the Reformers of Nova Scotia were able to convince the assembly that the withholding of such a resolution was not inconsistent with true loyalty. James Boyle Uniacke introduced a resolution that would have committed the Nova Scotian assembly unreservedly in favour of the English party, and even Wm. Young's amendment, though more moderate in tone, still contemplated the assimilation of the laws, language, and manners of the French Canadians to those of Great Britain. It remained for Howe in a speech of great discernment to convince the assembly that neither series of resolutions should pass, lest they do more harm than good and deceive Lord Durham as to opinion and conditions in the Maritime Provinces. In this speech, while still holding that rebellion was unjustified, inexpedient, and bound to fail, he contended that up to 1828 the Canadian party had been right in every particular, that the English party had up to the outbreak of rebellion exhibited a spirit quite as bad as anything which appeared on the other side, and that Nova Scotians should not encourage that party in their attempt to place their feet on the necks of their fellow subjects many of whom were as good and loyal and patriotic as themselves. In this speech, also, he foreshadowed the failure of the idea of anglicizing the French Canadians. "An idea now started," said he, "is that the French of Lower Canada should be Anglicized: it is urged that they should either be driven out of the Province or be forced to speak the English language. One no doubt could be as easily effected as the other." Subsequent events have proved that in this respect Howe's views were sounder than Lord Durham's.

In the course of the debate Uniacke had introduced the idea

of a confederation of all the colonies, but Howe urged that the house "should be careful how it places a recommendation on record which may be cited at a future day. Nova Scotia is one of the smallest of the colonies and might suffer in the arrangement. We might find that a confederation instead of leaving the Province with its present evils in connection with the Colonial Office, would establish an office in the backwoods of Canada more difficult of access than in London." He concluded with the following wise counsel, "I again insist that the House should not countenance the assumption of the Association which has sent in the address. As a specimen of the spirit of that party, I would refer to a paper which I hold in my hand, and which declares that the governor of the Province and the Attorney General should be hanged. That is the temper of the party which is arrayed against the Canadians. The House should not give an opinion on the subject in a hasty manner. It would be wiser now to defer the whole matter to next session than to express sentiments without due preparation on a matter of so much magnitude."

After Howe's speech further discussion of the resolutions was dropped only on the casting vote of the speaker. This indicates that the Nova Scotian assembly was evenly divided not on the question of loyalty to the British connection but on the wisdom of prejudicing the issues with which Lord Durham would have to deal on his arrival in Canada. The same assembly was almost evenly divided on the question of choosing their own delegates to present the case of Nova Scotia to Lord Durham at Quebec. As a matter of fact, they did choose five delegates for this purpose, all of the Reform pattern, but when Uniacke, the leader of the Tories in the assembly, who had not been chosen, threatened to obstruct further legislation unless this resolution was rescinded, they rescinded it; and ultimately the delegates were chosen by the governor and council. Of the five whom the assembly had selected, Archibald, Young, Howe, Huntington, and Doyle, only Young was chosen by the lieutenant-governor, and he had announced in the previous debates on the resolution that if he were not chosen he would go to Quebec on his own initiative and at his own expense. It should be noted that he presented a special letter to Lord Durham at Quebec explaining Nova Scotia's problems from the Reform point of view.

Such, then, was the state of mind of Nova Scotians when Lord Durham arrived in Canada. We will therefore expect to find that their sympathies and opinions continued to be divided in regard

to both his conduct and his *Report*. To illustrate this division of opinion I shall quote from the official pronouncements of the council and the assembly and from the chief organ of each party: the *Novascotian* for the Reformers and the *Times* for the Tories.

The *Novascotian* of March 8, 1838, informed the public of the appointment of Lord Durham and that a federal union of the North American provinces had been gravely discussed in the imperial parliament and recommended by Sir Robert Peel. It suggested that as the proposal came from such a source the colonial Tories would be bound to treat it with respect; but this time the *Novascotian* was out in its guess. It was precisely amongst the Tories of Nova Scotia that any sort of union with the Canadas, federal or legislative, found its strongest opponents, while the Reformers were willing to discuss the question on its merits and with an open mind. Throughout this period between the appointment of Lord Durham and the publication of his *Report*, the one more or less definite proposal that was before the general public and was expected to be included in his final recommendations was some sort of union of the colonies; and, while the *Novascotian* was generally non-committal due to the absence of Howe in Great Britain and the *Acadian recorder* was distinctly friendly to the idea, the *Times* repeatedly through its editorial page and correspondence columns condemned the proposal as radical and disloyal, despite the fact that both Uniacke and Johnston, two Tory delegates to Quebec, were attracted by the idea, if it could be worked out fairly for all concerned.

On June 26, 1838, the *Times* suggested that Lord Durham should recommend the incorporation of the North American provinces as part of Great Britain itself and pointed out the imperial significance of such a step, as follows:

The very act would give us a national claim, which might be further strengthened by connecting us more closely than at present, with the Imperial Legislature, and removing that separate jurisdiction under the Crown, but over us, which is now exercised by the Colonial Office. Something of this nature is necessary, and infinitely preferable to the dangerous experiment of a Confederation, which would still more implant the desire of independence, and soon cause a demand for the relinquishment of that dominion, which it is now seen will not be given up, while it can be supported with all the power of the Empire; or lead to a desperate struggle for separation, of the horrid consequences of which, it requires no far seeing vision to be assured. Lord Durham must work not for the retention for a hundred years or so of the Provinces but for such a perpetuity of them, that in the event of any unfortunate contingency happening to the supreme dominion in the Mother Country, there would be no diminution of her power or her influence, in removing the Government for a season, to this side of the Atlantic.

The issue of July 10 carried a very violent letter against confederation, signed *A Loyal Nova-Scotian*; and similar letters appeared in subsequent numbers. The editorial of August 14 begins to doubt the practical wisdom of Lord Durham and to prepare for future criticism of his proposals. The editorial of September 18 came out definitely against Lord Durham's federal scheme and was fearful that delegates might be chosen to meet Durham who would coincide with his views; but it ventured the opinion that there could not be found in the lower provinces enough loyally disposed and intelligent persons to form such a delegation of that shade of opinion. It concludes, "We are therefore (and we think the country at large may dismiss all anxiety on the subject) perfectly easy as to the opinions that will be offered to Lord Durham; and there can be little doubt that a statesman of his Lordship's capacity, will at once see the folly of pursuing a scheme, fraught with so much future danger, and unpalatable to the Colonies, over which his authority, though nominally the same, cannot be said to extend in the same degree as over the Canadas."

Throughout October the *Times* followed the fluctuating opinions about Lord Durham's resignation and the various reports of his plans for union of the colonies, and on the 30th it devoted almost an entire page to a final protest against the project. It could not understand Lord Durham's persistent desire for union and complained of his "bigotted pertinacity." It argued as follows:

Honest men, earnestly desirous to retain their allegiance to Great Britain, though holding extreme liberal opinions, will oppose this measure equally with the staunchest upholders of the monarchy; for with the elements and the influences by which it would be governed, the problem of its result must already be satisfactorily solved to every mind capable of appreciating its general bearing.

It is true the affairs of Canada have proved to all we hope convincingly, the folly of attempting to cope with British power; but a Confederated Union might and would soon present them under very different circumstances and naturally too—consolidating the strength of the whole, increasing their friends amongst potentates, republics, and at home in the Imperial Parliament, where they would assume the highest tone, thus morally and physically enabling them to defy the efforts of the government to keep them in a just subjection. Were any great question (suppose for argument that of Elective Councils) subversive of monarchical institutions, to come before it, which had passed all the Independent Legislatures of the Provinces, could a Confederation venture to disobey the popular voice so expressed. Their duty to the Parent Country, and their duty to their constituents thus clashing, it is no difficult matter to guess at their decision. On either side a choice of evils would lie—a severance of the natural allegiance in the one case—in the other a precedent weighty indeed, backed by the vast importance, population and resources of the Confederated Provinces, which would tell with a withering

effect on the second estate of the Monarchy. In a few years thereafter, we might witness Lord Durham soliciting the popular suffrages for a seat in the House of Peers; or plain Mr. Lambton, holding forth as a senator in the Republican Congress of Great Britain—perhaps aspiring to the Presidency.

After discussing certain practical objections to union, such as the weight of the central provinces against the lower provinces, the editor enunciates the proposition that what is only change in the mother country would be separation in the colonies, and concludes with the hope that the lower provinces would give such an expression to their opinions as would cause the project to be abandoned forever since he was convinced that if the British government were anxious to preserve the connection with the colonies, to give them a joint influence and a national character was not the method.

I have quoted the *Times* rather freely on the question of union because its arguments were consistent and almost identical against Lord Durham's other recommendations. It rang the changes on loyalty with an intensity that left no room for humour. In fact the only suggestion of humour found in the *Times* was an alleged letter from Queen Victoria to Lord Durham as follows:

Windsor, October 25th.

My Dear Lord Durham—Understanding from Mamma that you are coming back from Canada, may I beg the favour of your bringing with you a copy of the "Canadian Boat Song" as it is sung in that country. You well know the song I mean—It begins "Row, brothers, row" and a precious "row" they have been making amongst them.

With compliments to Lady D. and the children, Believe me, yours truly
VICTORIA R.

Throughout the period of Lord Durham's sojourn in Canada, Howe was in Great Britain and the *Novascotian* was edited by J. S. Thompson. He kept his readers in touch with events and opinions in the Canadas, the United States, and the British Isles, but was sparing of comment upon Durham's work and ideas. However, on October 4, he wrote a very scathing editorial on the factious conduct of the British parties that were forcing Durham to resign and he deplored the fact that the well-being of an important colony was held secondary to the success of "political cabal," which was more dangerous to the unity of the empire than the Canadian rebellion itself. He expressed further sympathy with Durham and confidence in his character and ability in the following paragraph: "Lord Durham's mission will stand marked in the history of Cabinets:—he was sent as a powerful and every way efficient messenger, to a distant and important, and distracted

part of the Empire,—he was immediately made subject to harassing and degrading attacks respecting minor arrangements,—his power was questioned, and could not be defined by those from whom it emanated,—and at a most critical period, just as he had entered successfully into his mission, the arm of his authority and of his influence was harshly broken, and he is left no resource except the immediate resignation of his most responsible and dangerous post; a post, which he seemed of all men, the most fitted to occupy." The editorial of October 11 alludes to Lord Durham's resignation as tantamount to removal and expresses the conviction that his lordship will be a thorough-going, affectionate, and most efficient advocate of the colonial cause in England. It refers to Durham's plan of union in the following manner:

We do not know what the details are, some of those intimated may be objectionable;—of the general scope of the plan there has been a great to-do, in the way of assertion, but precious little of argument. It is anti-monarchical, says one; it is more democratic than even republican arrangements, cries another,—but to ejaculate that the moon is made of green cheese, only affects the character of that luminary in very shallow minds,—and we have carefully, but in vain, sought of argument against the general principle of federation. As a proof of the ease with which assertions may be made,—while some talk about endangering monarchy and British connexion, others object that the scheme would be too monarchical and aristocratic, for this continent. We are not prepared to say which is right or which wrong, or how truth lies between, but would rejoice at the decline of passion, and the increase of logic, on the subject.

On November 15, Howe having returned from Great Britain took over the *Novascotian* again and announced that he had seen nothing abroad to cause him to vary any political opinion or to change his previous line of conduct. On the contrary, he returned more strongly than ever attached to those great principles of rational freedom which he had hitherto endeavoured to cherish. Apart from keeping his readers in touch with Lord Durham's movements in England and the fluctuations of opinion there and on the continent, he reserved his thunder until the publication of Lord Durham's *Report*.

In the meantime divisions of opinion and different attitudes towards Lord Durham find definite expression in the legislature. It is true that both houses of the legislature were agreed on the vote of £1,000 to be placed at the disposal of Sir John Colborne for the relief of the widows and families of those who had fallen in the Canadian rebellion; but this was the only aspect of the Canadian situation on which they were agreed.

On March 30, 1839, the council moved a series of seven resolu-

tions, three of which refer to Lord Durham's mission and are as follows:

That this House has learned with regret that His Lordship had suggested a form of government for these Colonies, the basis of which is at variance with that constitution which this House has ever been taught to revere, inasmuch as the abolition of the Upper Branches of their Legislatures formed a part of His Lordship's plan.

That although this proposition was subsequently abandoned, yet the suggestion alone emanating from so high an authority, and becoming publicly known, had a tendency to diminish the just weight and efficiency of these Bodies in public estimation, and in their intercourse with the other Branches of the Colonial Legislature.

That a federal union of the British North American Colonies would, in the opinion of this House, prove an extremely difficult if not an impracticable measure—that the experiment, if practicable, would be eminently dangerous to the interests of the Mother Country as well as of the Colonies—that its tendency would be to separate the Colonies from the Parent State, by imbuing the rising generation with a fondness for elective institutions to an extent inconsistent with the principles of the British constitution—that it would involve the Lower Colonies which are now contented, loyal and peaceable, in the political dissensions of Lower Canada, and add greatly to their general and local expenditures, without producing any adequate benefit to them, to the Canadas, or to the Empire at large.

These resolutions passed by a vote of seven to two, James W. Johnston and Norman F. Uniacke being the dissentients. Johnston who had been a delegate to Quebec with Uniacke's brother objected to these resolutions both because they were now uncalled for and because the details of the proposed union not being before the house they were not in a position to pass an opinion upon it.

On April 2 the assembly having searched the journals of the council moved and carried the following resolutions by a vote of 22 to 8:

That this House humbly rely upon the expressed determination of Her Majesty, and of both Houses of Parliament, to adopt such measures as may be necessary to provide for the defence and promote the prosperity and true interests of Her Majesty's Provinces in British North America.

That this House entertain no fears that any system of general confederation or any other material alteration of the Constitution of this Province will be sanctioned or enforced by Parliament, without the same being first submitted to the Legislature of Nova Scotia, for its approval or rejection.

That this House can see no propriety in the Legislature expressing premature opinions upon plans which have not been and never may be proposed nor of committing to delegated individuals the expression of their opinions upon questions that if raised at all, can only be wisely determined, after deliberate and mature consideration by both Branches of the Legislature in the Provinces they may be intended to affect, and in the midst of the population whose vital interests they may involve.

The first mention of the *Report* appeared in the *Times* of April 9, 1839: "In the meantime Lord Durham has presented his Report to the Parliament, and with the reckless disregard of customary usage and deference to constitutional practice, which distinguished his Lordship in Canada, he has caused this document to be printed in the papers, a course which has been productive of much remark, not very creditable to his Lordship, whose duty it was to have waited the consent of government to such a procedure." After summarizing the main recommendations of the *Report*, the editor comments as follows: "The extracts from the report show a decided leaning in favour of the radical principle in the Colonies—His Lordship's reasoning is all on that side, while, where there is any attempt at giving the Executive power, the instances are so incompatible with constitutional principles of government that his Lordship seems to have put them forth with no other view than that they should be condemned by all parties." Unlike the *Novascotian* and the *Acadian recorder*, the *Times* was in complete accord with Haliburton's bitter attacks upon Lord Durham. On March 12, 1839, it had published a long review of *The bubbles of Canada* in which Haliburton disappointed his earlier readers by foisting upon them a humourless compendium of official documents under a humorous title, and a laboured attack upon Lord Durham, whose sanity he questioned and whose proclamation he blamed for the second Canadian rebellion.

Between April 16 and 30 the *Times* also reprinted from the London *Times* Haliburton's *A reply to the report of the Earl of Durham*, in which he had attacked the *Report* with all the weapons he could command of irony, sarcasm, prejudice, misrepresentation, and sheer vituperation; and on May 7 its editorial page carried a long letter complimenting the editor on having published these letters, abusing the *Novascotian* for its praise of the *Report* and expressing the hope that Haliburton had neutralized the effects of Lord Durham's work in its tendencies toward separation and independence. Finally, on June 11, the *Times* published the address of the house of assembly of Upper Canada to the queen and the resolutions of the North American Colonial Association in London, February 25, 1839, and in editorial comments, after asserting that Durham could not escape the charge of encouraging republicanism, continued as follows:

We always found it a difficult matter to account for the opinion entertained of Lord Durham, that in his Canadian administration he would enter into an impartial examination of the causes which provoked rebellion. All his sympathies

were in favour of the discontented, and the friends of monarchy had only his professions, which have proved empty in proportion to their strength, to cheer them for the sacrifices they had made. It may be some palliation, that as the avowed leader of the English radicals his hands were tied, and that a course more independent of his own innate love of republican institutions would have lost him their affections, and entirely prostrated all his popular influence. But whatever may have been the considerations or the natural promptings of his Lordship, the sequel has shown a misplaced confidence. A more dangerous selection could not have been made in Britain for so important a trust as that reposed in him; and every well-wisher of British connection in the Provinces, will feel it his duty to neutralize the influence of the Report; for weak minds may be worked upon by its conclusions, and the enemies of British supremacy, secret and open, will take every advantage of a document, the production of an English nobleman, which so palpably forwards their designs and plays into their hands.

It is obvious that the Tory newspapers in Nova Scotia had a difficult role to play in maintaining an attitude of unquestioning subservience to the imperial government and at the same time registering their protests against the work and recommendations of its lord high commissioner. It was this difficulty which made them withhold judgment until the Tories in England had given them a cue by attacking the character of Durham's advisers, the cost of his retinue, and the legality of his ordinance; but, having been given this lead, they at once began to pile up their criticisms on the one foundation of loyalty, and to suggest that Durham had rashly thrown himself into the hands of radicals, republicans, and rebels, and had shown altogether too much admiration for the United States. This was the burden of all their editorials and this was the essence of Haliburton's philippics.

The Reform newspapers, on the other hand, suffered no such inhibitions and finding in the *Report* fullest confirmation of their criticisms of the local constitutions, they rushed to its defence with great eagerness. The following extracts from the editorials of the *Novascotian* for April 11 and 25 respectively are typical of the attitude of the Nova Scotian Reformers:

We have risen from the perusal of this admirable exposition of the state of the British Colonies in North America, with a higher estimate of the powers of the Noble Lord, and a more sanguine anticipation of the ultimate termination of Colonial misrule, than we had ever ventured to form. We did not believe that there was a nobleman in Britain who had the ability and the firmness to grapple with the great questions committed to Lord Durham's care, in a spirit so searching, and yet so frank; nor a man who, in one short summer, could collect and digest so much information, and draw from it such a volume of instruction to the Government and people of England. It is impossible for a Colonist to read this Report dispassionately through, and not recognize on every page the features of that system which has now become contemptible in the eyes of every man of common understanding, who has no interest in keeping it up. We wish a copy of this Report

was in the hands of every head of a family in Nova Scotia—for, although we shall take some pains, by extracts and abstracts, to give our readers some knowledge of its contents, it is a volume that every Colonist should have upon his shelf. The people of Nova Scotia should study it as the best exposition that has yet been given of the causes of the dissensions in the Canadas, and containing the best suggestion for the avoidance of kindred troubles in all the Provinces, that has yet appeared. The remedy for the state of conflict between the People and the local Executives, which prevails or has prevailed in all the Colonies, has two prime recommendations—being perfectly *simple* and eminently *British*—it is to let the *majority* and not the *minority* govern, and compell every Governor to select his advisers from those, *who enjoy the confidence of the People, and can command a majority in the popular Branch.* . . .

With what utter shame and confusion of face must the Tories and Officials of Nova Scotia peruse the following passages, and many others of a similar character, in this Report, *confirming, strengthening, and justifying* as they do, *every principle for which the Reformers of this Province have ardently contended.* For what have we asked?—that the local Government should be responsible to the representatives of the people. Lord Durham distinctly denies that there is any danger in the application of this principle—on the contrary he laughs at the idea of there being any peace or security in a Colony without it. We perceive, by the avidity with which our wiseacres seize upon and circulate whatever they fancy will weaken the effect of this Report, by undermining the noble writer's reputation, that they feel keenly—deeply, the disgrace and ridicule it heaps upon their heads. If the Delegates named by the Assembly had gone to Quebec, it might have been said that they misled his Lordship—but never let it be forgotten that this Report was prepared by an English Nobleman, having no interest to serve—no motive to bias his judgment, after hearing all parties—and, so far as Nova Scotia was concerned, *getting his information from Delegates selected by the Governor.* Out of their own mouths he has condemned them.

Throughout April and May Howe continued to publish instalments of the *Report* in the *Novascotian* with friendly comments, and in addition to keep his readers in touch with opinion in the Canadas and Great Britain. On July 11 he published Lord John Russell's speech of June 3 in the imperial parliament pointing out that he "negatives the soundest principle in Lord Durham's Report by arguments worthy of a school boy."¹ It was this speech that

¹As a matter of fact the Tories of Nova Scotia had anticipated the arguments and misgivings of Lord John Russell in the following letter of Mastigophorus to the Halifax *Times* of May 7, 1839, so that in meeting the local controversialists Howe served his apprenticeship for meeting Lord John:

"Now although the phrase of 'government in a minority' when applied to the ministry of the crown in the metropolitan state is perfectly intelligible, yet is it utterly incomprehensible in its application to the local executives and local houses of assembly in a colony? The colonial governors are the representatives, not the ministers, of the sovereign. As respects the acts of their administration they are constitutionally responsible to the crown, and the ministry to parliament for sanctioning these acts if *wrong*; but as respects the people of the colony in which these governors execute the delegated functions of royalty, they are irresponsible, and, so far as they are unrestricted by the King and the laws, supreme. As they are not by the constitution subjected to any responsibility to the people, so also, of necessity, must those be who are their Executive Councillors, for this plain simple reason, that, the governor remaining irresponsible save to his sovereign, if his advisers are to be considered as the organs,

led Howe to write his *Letters* to Lord John Russell, in the belief that the colonial secretary was lacking not so much in goodwill as in local knowledge; and, although the *Letters* may not have had much immediate influence upon Lord John, they helped Howe and his supporters to clarify their own position while amplifying and popularizing the main principles of Durham's *Report*. Judging from these *Letters* and from Howe's earlier and later attitudes towards responsible government as such, it would appear that the contribution of Durham to the reform movement in Nova Scotia lay in confirming the faith of these men in the essential justice of the British government and in the wisdom of their own previous efforts for constitutional reform rather than in introducing them to new ideas. Though Howe in his twelve resolutions of 1837 had offered an alternative solution of the problem, henceforth he concentrated upon responsible government alone, and definitely repudiated the alternative of an elective council. As a matter of fact, he had repudiated this alternative as soon as the old council

by which he acts, and they made to answer to the people for the advice they give, then that portion of the independent prerogative of sovereignty which the crown delegates to the executive head of a colonial government is obviously annihilated. If this mode of reasoning be correct, and I think it will be difficult to show that it is otherwise, what would be the inevitable consequence of making, as Lord Durham proposes, the executive responsible to the representative body? What but to make the colony whose constitution was thus innovated upon, independent of the parent state, save only as respects the controlling influence of the upper branch of the legislature! Follow his lordship one step further in his career of constitution mending, abolish the legislative council and what remains is pure democracy! But if, for argument sake, it is to be conceded that this scheme of making the executive and the heads of departments responsible to the representative branch is practicable and consistent with the principles of the constitution, the beneficial practical operation which would result from it is surely quite too obvious to be insisted on. Of course, to have submitted the administration of the government of Upper Canada unreservedly to Bidwell, McKenzie, and their radical majorities, when they were in the zenith in the popular branch, would have strengthened British influence in that colony, have prevented all subsequent troubles and bloodshed, and would have fixed the connexion of that province with the parent state upon a basis never to be shaken! Doubtless, the French majorities under Lord Aylmer, would have selected responsible counsellors, that would have administered the government of Lower Canada to the perfect satisfaction of *all* the people, and in a manner to secure it forever 'as an appanage to the British Crown!' Possibly, if we had confided, a session or two ago, the reins of state in Nova Scotia to Mr. Howe, Mr. Huntington and Mr. Young, a responsible ministry of their selection would have made, ere this, our miserable and oppressed country 'free and happy,' and themselves the pride and delights of mankind! If, Mr. Editor, the people of Nova Scotia are prepared to go the length that Lord Durham and his able advocate would lead them, let the helm of the ship of the state be freely surrendered to our 'sage Palinurus' Mr. Howe,—let Lord Durham, as Lord High Commissioner, as Lord High Admiral, or what you will, hoist his flag upon her mast, and

Teucro duce et auspice Teucro

.....

Cras ingens iterabimus aequor.

We shall smoothly and rapidly be borne with a flowing sail, to that desired haven, 'the free institutions of the United States of America,' and, anchored there in the full enjoyment of their countless blessings, we shall remember the storms and perils, the tyranny and oppression of that limited monarchy from which we shall have happily escaped, only to contrast them with the happiness of our present lot."

was divided, fully a year before Lord Durham's *Report* appeared; and, in 1838 also, Huntington had given a practical demonstration of his faith in responsible government when he resigned his seat in the executive council on the clear-cut principle that it should have been constituted like a British cabinet from the party having the majority in the assembly.

In other words, by lending the prestige of a great name and a Liberal imperialist, Lord Durham strengthened the Reformers in their struggle for responsible government; but his recommendation was not the first, nor was it adopted until Howe, Huntington, Young, and the other Reformers had shown the imperial government the futility of any other substitute. Hence Howe could say with truth in 1840:

It has been said that the view has been learned from the Earl of Durham. I admit that, as respects that nobleman's opinion, I am glad to have such authority in support of my argument; but it was not learned from him. This House had asked for a government responsible in local affairs, before his Lordship saw this continent. I would refer to the address of 1837; in that we asked for such responsibility as would assure to the Province the fair influence of its Legislature, in all matters, and the spirit of the British Constitution. The address of 1838 was of the same character, and the report of the Earl of Durham did not appear until the spring of 1839. I am happy to have the concurrence of so celebrated a man; but I think it right to show that we are not mere followers of his report, but had asked for responsible government before that document appeared.

Or again, in 1850: "Sir, the constitution now in operation rests upon the 'fiat of no Colonial Secretary' but upon the treasured experience of fifteen years of painful and laborious discipline: . . . we owe it to no Colonial Secretary; we wrested it, step by step, against the prejudices and apprehensions of various secretaries from 1837 to 1847. It was the vigour and intelligence of the British colonists, steadfastly aiming at high objects, that won this victory."

It is generally conceded that the great virtue of the *Report*, and what has made it a text-book for Liberal imperialists, was its insistence upon the necessity of maintaining the unity of the empire and the practicability of combining unity with the fullest measure of local self-government. I have argued that all parties in Nova Scotia were unanimous as to the first principle, that the Reformers had insisted upon the second long before Lord Durham approached the problem, and that they worked it out in their own way in the decade subsequent to his *Report*.

But there were other recommendations in the *Report* of very great importance, such as his attitude towards national consciousness, the United States, and popular education. Time will not

permit me to illustrate the response of Nova Scotians to these recommendations; but I cannot conclude without saying that none of these ideas was new to Nova Scotians, nor could they have been realized immediately. We have already seen that the Tories were violently opposed to the suggestion of union with the Canadas and that only the Reformers were willing to consider the proposal on its merits and by the proper constitutional procedure. In their attitude towards the United States the Tories of Nova Scotia needed both the theoretical views of Durham and the practical demonstration, which he had given the official party of the Canadas, of courtesy in international relations; but here as elsewhere it was only the Reformers who appreciated his attitude. In this period Howe repeatedly turned from his advocacy of responsible government and imperial unity to plead with Stewart, Johnston, Uniacke, and others for courtesy and fairness in all references to their great neighbours and their institutions. In regard to popular education too, McCulloch of Pictou was in the field twenty years before Durham had seen this continent, and after him Howe became the persistent advocate of province-wide education, not merely to assail the Tory monopoly of educational institutions, but as the only sure foundation of rational liberty and intelligent self-government.

I conclude, therefore, as I began, with the assertion that Nova Scotia's attitude towards Lord Durham's mission was one of critical appreciation according to party affiliations: the Tories in the main were unsympathetic; the Reformers were hopeful of a permanent solution of a common problem. The same generalizations apply to the reception of the *Report*. Even his obvious imperialism was suspected by the former and his broad outlook was misrepresented as disguised republicanism. But to the Reformers his style was matchless, his insight remarkable, and his main recommendations beyond criticism. Both parties conceded that the magic of his name and station would have a powerful effect for good or ill; and, for that reason, the Tories strove with might and main to neutralize this effect, while the Reformers appealed to his authority whenever possible in order to influence the imperial government in their favour. That is why Lord Durham may appear to have had more influence upon the evolution of self-government in Nova Scotia than an examination of the facts actually reveals.

D. C. HARVEY

The Public Archives of Nova Scotia, Halifax.

LORD DURHAM'S REPORT AND ITS CONSEQUENCES

I

COMMEMORATIVE celebrations seldom err in the direction of restraint. The sixtieth anniversary of Confederation in 1927 served to cover that great achievement, I sometimes think, with several new layers of conventional prepossessions. The hundred and fiftieth anniversary of the constitution of the United States a year or so ago passed with scarcely a ripple upon the surface to suggest that an angel had been troubling the waters. A series of lectures in commemoration of the Durham mission is apt to leave the scene littered with superlatives. The scholarly restraint already in evidence in this series becomes an added obligation as one approaches the great *Report* itself. There may be more superlatives in this closing lecture than in any of the others, but let me try also, as resolutely as I can, to see this great state paper, warts and all, as it really was in 1839.

The *Report* has passed through curious vicissitudes. Sir George Arthur pronounced it "the worst evil that has yet befallen Upper Canada." John Beverley Robinson, then in London and the first Canadian to see the *Report*, marvelled at its inaccuracies with regard to Upper Canada—"the ex parte evidence," the "unknown witnesses . . . full of unknown prejudices."¹ Even the select committee of the Upper Canadian assembly joined the attack. The Tory press referred to Charles Buller as Lord Durham's "chief scavenger . . . incessantly employed in searching the cesspools of discontent, disloyalty and sedition." Durham's own heart was "rotten at the core and radically incorrigible." In Great Britain the government itself appropriated many of Durham's recommendations but singled out the greatest of them all for official repudiation. Responsible government, in the opinion of Lord John Russell, was "one of the most important points contained in Lord Durham's report and one on which I differ with him." "The opinion of this country and this government," added Melbourne himself in the house of lords, "was entirely opposed to independent responsible government." For seven years the net effect of Lord Durham's *Report* upon the colonial office was to confirm this doctrine and to harden the official temper of Whig and Tory alike in opposition. Not only were Russell and

¹A valid criticism. Professor New has suggested that with regard to Upper Canada "the teacher of history, who is concerned only with facts, might do well to keep his students away from it altogether."

Stanley in agreement but there is evidence of consultation in order to present a united front against responsible government.

On the other hand, the Reformers on both sides of the Atlantic took the *Report* as their text-book. Hincks, who had flown responsible government from the masthead from the very first issue of the *Examiner*, published the *Report* in pamphlet form and dedicated it to Robert Baldwin, "the zealous, eloquent and able advocate of those constitutional principles which have been at last recognized by a Governor-General of Canada." In the *Nova-scotian* of Joseph Howe the *Report* ran like wildfire through every constituency of the province. A few hours before Durham's death, when he was to all appearances a broken man, they read a letter to him from Charles Buller with the serene and sprightly courage which Buller alone, perhaps, could have avowed in England at that time. A few days later in a letter to Lady Mary Lambton, Durham's daughter, afterwards Lady Elgin, Buller added a more sombre prophecy: "If there is anything certain in the course of events, it is that the great principles with which he has linked his name, will henceforth, amid all the chances of party politics and passing events, make good their sure and steady way."

With the achievement of responsible government² Durham's *Report* passed into a legend, and remained for more than two generations a shrine for unhistorical veneration. The triumph of a cause usually brings an era of cant phrases. It was forgotten that the day had been won in the end not by spectacular advocacy but by empirical methods brought to bear by disciplined political parties. It was forgotten that three of the four or five major recommendations of the *Report* were wide of the mark. The imperial administration of public lands proved to be a dead letter. Durham's forecast for the French race in Canada was a devastating miscalculation. The avowed purpose of the union of the two Canadas was defeated by the union itself. For responsible government Durham's debt to Robert Baldwin was forgotten or remained almost unknown for eighty-five years. In this unhistorical isolation the *Report* became "the Magna Charta of Canadian liberties." Like many another classic it was more admired than read.

With the transfer of the *Durham papers* to the Public Archives in 1907 and 1922 a period of more critical scholarship threatened for a time to dethrone the Durham tradition. The feet of clay became very apparent. Durham's infirmities of temper and of

²In Nova Scotia on January 28, 1848, and in Canada in the following March.

judgment; his singular lack of humour; his real diffidence with associates of first-rate ability in contrast with the arrogance usually attributed to him by his enemies; the loyalty but disillusionment of the young radicals who had followed his star to Canada in the hope of finding it the day-star of a new era upon his return to British public life; all this became in a few months the subject of critical speculation. It was evident that many of Durham's most ardent admirers were remote and beneath him in rank. The subtle compromises and accommodations of parliamentary life were utterly beyond him. Extremes of diffidence and assertiveness sometimes confounded his associates. A ripple of laughter in the house of lords, a gentle reproach from Lady Durham for rudeness to her at the dinner table, were apt to bring impulsive and astonishing reactions. The innocent captain of a Canadian river-boat was once dumbfounded by Durham's arrogance. His sensitiveness to newspaper comment in Canada and the impulsiveness of his resignation exasperated his staff beyond endurance until Charles Buller and Gibbon Wakefield drafted a joint letter to him which must be quoted even today with bated breath. Protesting against his "morbid state of feeling," his practice of "reading blackguard attacks in the newspapers"—the "impertinences and slander of one penny & 2 half penny papers"—they reminded him of "the noblest position ever occupied by any public man in England since the first Pitt." "You have courted those high and daring enterprises, which end in triumph or political death"—"a catastrophe after which I believe in my conscience [this in Buller's handwriting] that you and your best friends will attach little value to the preservation of your health or even your life." "If you entertain the idea of resigning, you should not tender your resignation in the first place to Mr. McGill." "I sometimes think [Gibbon Wakefield added bitterly] that rather than return home after the failure of your mission, it were better that I should take my passage from New York with poor Turton, & hide my head in India."

This phase of hasty criticism soon passed, however; and the *Calendar of the Durham papers*,³ published in 1923, is a model of what that sort of thing ought to be—scrupulously fair, discreet, and scholarly. As the editor moved away from the foothills he seems to have recaptured something of the distant vision of the mountain peaks beyond. In the luminous pages of Professor New's biography Durham is accorded the most discerning praise he has ever

³Edited by William Smith, Canadian Archives report.

received—robust opinions based upon an honest enthusiasm for the subject. Let us be thankful that Mr. New's biography (forgive the pun!) is not the "new biography" of another school. Our concern here, however, is "the *Report* and its consequences"; and it is probably true that an iconoclast could make havoc of many of its most confident recommendations.

II

What was Durham's specific for the integration of the empire? Measured by sheer bulk and emphasis, both in the *Report* itself and in the official correspondence, the resplendent vision of imperial administration for the public lands was probably regarded as the most constructive contribution of the Durham mission. The ablest men on the staff were assigned to it—Charles Buller himself as chief commissioner and Gibbon Wakefield as architect and draftsman. "This [wrote Durham] is the object of deepest moment to all, and the first business of the Government." Of all functions of authority this was "most full of good and evil consequences." A policy of imperial land sales with a central fund for the colonization of this "ample appanage which God and Nature have set aside in the New World" was "more calculated [he wrote] than any other reform whatever to attach the people of North America to Your Majesty's throne and to cement and perpetuate an intimate connexion between the colonies and the mother country."⁴

Few will be found to question the supreme importance of public lands in a frontier economy; but if it is the most important business of government it is also in all probability the dullest. No phase of the Durham mission was organized with more thorough-going efficiency. The land papers, many of which came back to the Public Archives in 1907 in the same box in which they crossed the Atlantic in 1838, are probably the most valuable and exhaustive historical evidence accumulated by the Durham mission. The early prodigality of free grants, the truly appalling story of land poverty in a wilderness of undeveloped acreage in both the Canadas, must be found even today in these invaluable records. Of 17,000,000 acres surveyed in Upper Canada less than 700,000 acres of inferior quality remained open to grant. "It may almost be said therefore," wrote Durham, "that the whole of the public lands in Upper Canada have been alienated by the Government"

⁴*Report*, ed. Sir C. P. Lucas (Oxford, 1912), II, 13, 207.

(p. 219), yet "perhaps less than a tenth" thus granted had been "occupied by settlers, much less reclaimed and cultivated" (p. 223).

From this depressing picture Durham turned (pp. 209 ff.) to the United States with the most glowing tribute ever paid to the orthodox Hamiltonian doctrine of the public domain:

The system of the United States appears to combine all the chief requisites of the greatest efficiency. It is uniform throughout the vast federation; it is unchangeable save by Congress, and has never been materially altered; it renders the acquisition of new land easy, and yet, by means of a price, restricts appropriation to the actual wants of the settler; it is so simple as to be readily understood; it provides for accurate surveys and against needless delays; it gives an instant and secure title; and it admits of no favouritism, but distributes the public property amongst all classes and persons upon precisely equal terms. That system has promoted an amount of immigration and settlement, of which the history of the world affords no other example; and it has produced to the United States a revenue which has averaged about half a million sterling per annum, and has amounted in one twelve-month to above four millions sterling, or more than the whole expenditure of the Federal Government.

Durham's dream was an imperial counterpart to this utopian system for the British Empire. But the vision, for North America at any rate, came too late. For the United States as for the British provinces the frontier was already on the march. For nearly two decades before the *Report* was written congress had been assailed by Thomas Hart Benton's "log cabin bills." Within a single generation not only the orthodox doctrine of the public domain but Henry Clay's bold compromise (1832), and Calhoun's project of "retrocession" (1837), were to disappear in the uncompromising struggle between North and South, slave and free. The orgy of railway land grants which began in 1850 with the Illinois Central under the necromancy of Stephen Douglas fairly wrecked the old order. The Union Pacific, the first of the great transcontinentals, got land grants of 12,000,000 acres; the Northern Pacific of 43,000,000 acres. Meanwhile the industrial north had been won to the cause of free land by the prospect of forestalling the south in the settlement of the west. In 1862, in the throes of civil war, Abraham Lincoln gave his sanction to the historic Homestead Bill. Few measures of the modern world have made such an appeal to the imagination of millions, and the free homestead became a turning point in the history of the republic.

In Upper Canada also the frontier was already on the march. Nearly a decade and a half before the Durham mission a halt had been called under Maitland to the orgy of free grants, but Sydenham himself surrendered to them for colonization roads, and the

Clear Grits under George Brown and William McDougall established at last the ascendancy of the frontier. Cheap or free land seemed the only hope of preventing the swarm of settlers then pouring into the St. Lawrence from disappearing almost as rapidly through the spout of the funnel at the other end of the province into the illimitable prairies of the middle west. In truth no policy ever had a slighter chance of success than Durham's dream of imperializing this "ample appanage set aside by God and Nature in the New World for those whose lot has assigned them but insufficient portions in the Old." There is much to be said on its merits for the Wakefield technique of land sales and systematic colonization. The wastage of human material in the free-homestead system west of the 100th meridian in both Canada and the United States was truly appalling.⁵ But land policy lay near the root of the whole fight for responsible government in the Canadas, and provincial control of public lands formed the first-fruits of that achievement.

III

In French Canada Durham's *Report* is chiefly remembered for a vastly different tradition. Durham's forecast of French nationality is one of the land-marks—one of the turning-points, I am inclined to think—in the political philosophy of French Canada. It is clear from Buller's own account of the mission that many of Durham's prepossessions were formed before he left England, and they were confirmed by the first bundle of newspapers that came aboard the *Hastings* at Father Point.

It might be a salutary exercise for an English-speaking audience to register upon their own minds the probable effect of a few of these historic passages as read for the first time by LaFontaine, Viger, and Girouard a hundred years ago:

A plan by which it is proposed to ensure the tranquil government of Lower Canada, must include in itself the means of putting an end to the agitation of national disputes in the legislature, by settling, at once and for ever, the national character of the Province. I entertain no doubts as to the national character which must be given to Lower Canada; it must be that of the British Empire; that of the majority of the population of British America; that of the great race which must, in the lapse of no long period of time, be predominant over the whole North American Continent. Without effecting the change so rapidly or so roughly as to shock the feelings and trample on the welfare of the existing generation, it must hence-

⁵In Saskatchewan about 57 per cent of homestead entries from 1911 to 1931 were cancelled without reaching the patent registers—57 out of every hundred free-homesteaders perished in no man's land without ever owning their "free" homestead.

forth be the first and steady purpose of the British Government to establish an English population, with English laws and language, in this Province, and to trust its government to none but a decidedly English Legislature [pp. 288 ff.].

Their nationality is, after all, an inheritance; and they must be not too severely punished, because they have dreamed of maintaining on the distant banks of the St. Lawrence, and transmitting to their posterity, the language, the manners, and the institutions of that great nation, that for two centuries gave the tone of thought to the European Continent . . . [p. 289].

Whatever may happen, whatever government shall be established over them, British or American, they can see no hope for their nationality . . . [p. 291].

And is this French Canadian nationality one which, for the good merely of that people, we ought to strive to perpetuate, even if it were possible? I know of no national distinctions marking and continuing a more hopeless inferiority . . . [p. 292].

The evils of poverty and dependence would merely be aggravated in a ten-fold degree, by a spirit of jealous and resentful nationality, which should separate the working class of the community from the possessors of wealth and employers of labour . . . [p. 293].

There can hardly be conceived a nationality more destitute of all that can invigorate and elevate a people, than that which is exhibited by the descendants of the French in Lower Canada, owing to their retaining their peculiar language and manners. They are a people with no history, and no literature . . . [p. 294].

Lower Canada must be governed now, as it must be hereafter, by an English population . . . [p. 296].

I believe that tranquillity can only be restored by subjecting the Province to the vigorous rule of an English majority; and that the only efficacious government would be that formed by a legislative union . . . [p. 307].

Never again will the present generation of French Canadians yield a loyal submission to a British Government; never again will the English population tolerate the authority of a House of Assembly, in which the French shall possess or even approximate to a majority [p. 53].

It was Durham's misfortune to reach Canada when racial antipathies were at their height and to spend the brief months of his visit chiefly in the midst of them. But his diagnosis even of what he saw has been disputed with authority, and it will be enough perhaps to make two observations upon the consequences in Canadian history.

Whatever truth there may have been (and there was a great deal) in Durham's scathing comment that French Canadians in 1838 were "a people with no history, and no literature" and that they could "see no hope for their nationality," it seems clear that they were literally galvanized into action by the *Report* itself. French Canada of 1839 deliberately set itself to falsify Lord Durham's prophecy and who will say that it has not succeeded?

The solid phalanx from Canada East closed their ranks at the union and won during the next two decades and a half the status which was underwritten so effectually in confederation. Young newspaper editors flung themselves into the cause. This people with no history sent M. Georges Faribault (under the LaFontaine-Baldwin administration) to Paris to begin a systematic accumulation of French archives which to this day has left its counterpart in the English language in Canada far behind. The first volume of Garneau's *Histoire du Canada* was published during the Metcalfe crisis. It was under Metcalfe, too, that the French language was for the first time officially recognized after the union.⁶ One is inclined to doubt whether any single stimulus has been used more effectively to serve the cause of French nationalism in Canada than the pages of Lord Durham's *Report*. "Je me souviens" still remains the watchword of French Canada.

But there is another aspect which must have filled Durham himself, had he lived, with poignant reflections. The solid phalanx of French-Canadian Reformers under LaFontaine were the shock troops that won the most cherished of all Durham's recommendations. The ink was scarcely dry on the *Report* when Francis Hincks, the real architect of the party which won responsible government in Canada in 1848, opened a secret and confidential correspondence with LaFontaine designed to command a working majority in the legislature. The friendship which followed between Baldwin and LaFontaine was the sheet-anchor of the Reform cause. It was they who forced the Bagot incident in 1842; and when the Reformers were beaten in Canada West in 1844 LaFontaine had to find a constituency for Baldwin himself in Rimouski. It was LaFontaine in the greatest speech of his life and in the French language who carried the caucus of the Reform party against Papineau's bitter invective.⁷ It was LaFontaine to whom Elgin turned to form the first responsible ministry in the old province of Canada. There is evidence that Buller foresaw this technique and perhaps inspired Hincks's strategy, but the long story of co-operation between Baldwin and LaFontaine, between Hincks himself and Morin, between Cartier and Macdonald is surely an ironical commentary upon Durham's prophecy: "never again will the present generation of French Canadians yield a loyal submission to a British Government."

⁶The resolution was moved with Metcalfe's approval by D. B. Papineau, brother of Louis-Joseph himself.

⁷Papineau maintained that responsible government was the product of a "narrow and malevolent genius"—"ruinous and disastrous" to Canadian rights.

I should be inclined to say that the greatest achievement of the French race upon this continent was not before the conquest in 1763 but after it; not before but after the War of 1812; not before but after Lord Durham's *Report*.

IV

Perverted also by the spectre of race was a third project of the Durham mission—the union of the British provinces.

It will be impossible here to trace a multitude of practical measures, the product of Durham's insatiable interest in commerce and industry, in railways and canals, and in the technique of commonplace government for practical ends. The passages on municipal institutions, on taxation, on roads and transportation, on a "liberal and general system of public education," remain classics of Canadian government. "The entire neglect of education . . . more than any other cause, contributed to render this people ungovernable." "The state of New York [he wrote] made its own St. Lawrence from Lake Erie to the Hudson"—the Erie Canal (1825), short-circuiting what Professor Creighton has called the commercial empire of the St. Lawrence. Under the direction of special commissioners Durham explored the greatest body of expert evidence and opinion hitherto assembled in the British provinces; and in Lord Sydenham who carried so many of Durham's recommendations into effect they devolved upon the ablest administrator, in all probability, who ever governed this country.

Durham's foray into British-American union, however, scarcely belongs to this category. "On my first arrival in Canada [he wrote] I was strongly inclined to the project of a federal union." An insight into the technique of federalism, to be sure, was vouchsafed to few British statesmen of that day. At any rate Roebuck's plan, which Durham brought with him to Canada, was surely one of the maddest arm-chair schemes of federal union ever devised by the human intellect. The delegates summoned by Durham from Nova Scotia and New Brunswick soon made it clear that, however plausible in theory, no inter-provincial union was feasible in 1838. Durham turned in his *Report* to a legislative union of Upper and Lower Canada; but by this time the chief motive was no longer the general cause of British-American union, and indeed the Canadian union was to prove a strange paradox. Designed to subordinate the French, it vindicated for all time their political survival; and under the guise of union it was to prove so

intolerable that its dissolution became the first prerequisite of confederation.

In its economic aspect the reunion of the Canadas had long been the goal of the Montreal merchants in their frustrated dream of commercial empire by way of the St. Lawrence. With his flair for industrial and commercial expansion Durham might have been expected to respond to this as to other aspects of imperial enterprise. Fiscal integration was as necessary as canals, roads, and railways for the prosperity of the Canadas. But Durham was quick to see that economic union as expounded by the Moffatts, the McGills, and the Badgleys, was "a pet Montreal project, beginning and ending in Montreal selfishness." The real motive for the Canadian union is not far to seek; and indeed it is now known to have been decided upon in London more than a month before the *Report* reached the colonial office.

"It is laid down by all as a fundamental principle," Melbourne wrote to Russell in December, 1838, "that the French must not be reinstated in power in Lower Canada." Sydenham afterwards added a characteristic variation upon this theme. "If we fail in carrying it [the union] you may as well give up the Canadas at once, for I know no means of governing either." There have been many political short-cuts in Canadian history but few that have been at once so plausible and so delusive. The union by which Sydenham had hoped to break up the old party alignments⁸ and govern by means of subservient coalitions was utilized, as we have seen, by the shrewdest political strategist of his day—Francis Hincks—to weld the Upper Canadian "ultras" and the Lower Canadian Reformers into a compact political party for the first time. With nothing but distrust in his mind for the union and its obvious purpose, LaFontaine slowly yielded to this insinuating strategy. Hincks's first letter was written on the subject of Durham's *Report* in April, 1839. From that date to June, 1841, no fewer than thirty-four letters are to be found in the *LaFontaine papers*—so discreet and confidential that Hincks was afraid to entrust them even to the post office. The Baldwin-LaFontaine alliance proved to be a milestone in Canadian politics, for it vindicated, as we have seen, the most cherished doctrine of the great *Report* itself in the most critical and decisive experiment of the second empire.

The most paradoxical result of the union, however, was no fault of Durham. The short-sighted device of equalizing the

⁸"The whole system . . . must then be broken up and remodelled."

representation in the legislature for the two sections of the province safeguarded an English-speaking majority in 1841; but the shoe was on the other foot when the population of Canada West surpassed that of Canada East in 1851. By 1858 the Clear Grit war-cry of "rep. by pop." meant that the days of the Canadian union were numbered. The common ground upon which both parties met for the great coalition of 1864 was a compact at any cost to break the union: by a multiple federation if possible, a dual federation if necessary. Thus the Canadian union produced neither racial nor political unification, and the larger cause of British-American union still awaited a deliverer.

V

Lord Durham's advocacy of responsible government has left his *Report* enshrined with the great political literature of our language. At this centenary I can think of nothing more admirable than Durham's political courage in avowing this dynamic reform; but let us begin with the humble men who had already conceived the great principle and were slowly evolving the technique by which it was won at last.

There is no evidence in England or indeed in Canada before the interview of the two Baldwins with Durham in Toronto in August, 1838, that what we call responsible government had found a lodgement in Durham's indomitable mind. Robert Baldwin's historic memorandum, on the other hand, was in Glenelg's hands as early as 1836; a copy of it was sent to Durham himself in 1838; it was published in the *British parliamentary papers* a few weeks after Durham's own *Report*, and it found its way into *The Times* by the sheer weight, it would seem, of its own merit.⁹ It is obvious (from internal evidence alone), that Baldwin's memorandum lay before Durham on the table when the most dynamic passages of the *Report* were being written; and the importance attached to it is attested by its worn appearance in the *Durham papers*.

It is true also that the technique of responsible government had already been foreshadowed in at least three of the British provinces. In Upper Canada Baldwin's tactics with Sir Francis Head in 1836 were awkwardly but uncompromisingly consistent,

⁹Baldwin had crossed to London in 1836 to forestall, if possible, the Canadian rebellions. Glenelg declined to receive him: no doubt with the fate of Lord Goderich in mind after granting an interview to Mackenzie in 1832. The Upper Canadian Tories had deluged "Goosie" Goderich with abuse. From his lodging house in London Baldwin was constrained to address to Glenelg the most prophetic forecast ever written for responsible government.

and his "great principle" had been reduced to a body of doctrine almost prophetic, as we have seen, in its legal accuracy. As early as 1837 New Brunswick, after no fewer than three delegations to the colonial office, secured not only the control of land revenues for the first time but a change in the personnel of the executive council to command the confidence of the assembly; but having secured this particular responsible government for their own immediate purpose they obligingly waived the right to claim it "at all times" during the turmoil in the Canadas.¹⁰ In Nova Scotia the party was already in existence in the assembly which had carried Howe's address to the throne for responsible government in April, 1837, and was soon to carry, by a vote of 30 to 12, the neatest demonstration of that historic technique in the resolution of no confidence in February, 1840. In June, 1838, while the Durham mission was in Canada, Howe had an interview with Murdock and Glenelg himself at the colonial office. The result can only be surmised, for it was too confidential, as Howe notes in his diary, to be put into writing which "might fall into other hands." It may be fair, however, to recall that Baldwin's memorandum was already in Glenelg's hands, and that Howe himself always regarded Glenelg's forced retirement before the reactionary policy of Lord John Russell as an "incomprehensible disgrace." "If conceded in any one Colony," noted Stephen on the Nova Scotian correspondence, "it must be granted for all." I am inclined to think that both the principles and the technique which finally won in 1848 were already in train in 1839, and that Charles Buller's retort to Melbourne and Lord John Russell at that time was well within the mark: responsible government, though officially repudiated by the government, "would inevitably be established by the people themselves." Let it be repeated that it was won in the end by disciplined political parties who set themselves deliberately to destroy every alternative to it in the Russell-Sydenham régime.

But the great work of Lord Durham belongs to another order. Here was the greatest pro-consul who had ever left England on such a mission. His commission carried his authority to every province. The suspension of the Lower Canadian constitution endowed him with more power in that province than Carleton had wielded under the *Quebec Act*. Less than a year before the Durham mission began, Lord John Russell himself had carried in the house of commons his pontifical resolutions against responsible

¹⁰Glenelg had commended their "just delicacy" in not exacting a "peremptory rule."

government. With his knowledge of both Melbourne and Russell, Durham must surely have been able to forecast their official repudiation of those principles in his own *Report*. With a stroke of courage equal to any in his whole career, and with a consummate artistry which has never been excelled in a British state paper, Lord Durham seized upon the doctrine formulated by an obscure provincial lawyer in Toronto and transmuted the precise legalistic phraseology of Robert Baldwin into an everlasting war-cry for self-government:

We are not now to consider the policy of establishing representative government in the North American Colonies. That has been irrevocably done. . . . To conduct their Government harmoniously, in accordance with its established principles, is now the business of its rulers; and I know not how it is possible to secure that harmony in any other way, than by administering the Government on those principles which have been found perfectly efficacious in Great Britain. I would not impair a single prerogative of the Crown. . . . But the Crown must, on the other hand, submit to the necessary consequences of representative institutions; and if it has to carry on the Government in unison with a representative body, it must consent to carry it on by means of those in whom that representative body has confidence. . . .

Every purpose of popular control might be combined with every advantage of vesting the immediate choice of advisers in the Crown, were the Colonial Governor to be instructed to secure the co-operation of the Assembly in his policy, by entrusting its administration to such men as could command a majority. . . . This change might be effected by a single despatch containing such instructions [pp. 278 ff.].

Within six months the paragraphs of the *Report* on responsible government were household words in the British provinces, and they never ceased to inspire the rest of the conflict like the cadences of an old litany. The Durham flag was a rallying point at last for the warring factions of Upper Canada. The old system, declared Howe in Nova Scotia, was "now become contemptible in the eyes of every man of common understanding, who has no interest in keeping it up." In Howe's own tactics there is a new confidence and an assured sense of direction; and indeed in many a passage in the four *Letters to Lord John Russell* (September, 1839) there is unmistakable evidence both of the subject-matter and of the sustained dignity of the great *Report*.

In Upper Canada one immediate result of the *Report* must have been prodigious. It enfiladed the old Tory tradition that reform was synonymous with treason and republicanism. No reformer from Gourelay to Baldwin himself had escaped that imputation, and now the greatest imperialist of his day, a statesman whose attachment to the young queen and the prospects of

her reign stopped only this side of idolatry, had sanctified the Reform cause with an ardour almost apostolic in its benediction. The solution, as Howe exclaimed, was found to be "perfectly simple and eminently *British*." The Upper-Canadian Tory lowered his arms and opened his mind for the first time. Fisticuffs and bloodshed still attended the Durham meetings at Cobourg, at Hamilton, at Davis's Tavern near Toronto where Hincks himself narrowly escaped with his life; but when men like Egerton Ryerson and officials of the Orange Order could get around the corner on two wheels, it was clear (if you will allow me to mix my metaphors) that there was a sound of going in the tops of the mulberry trees. Durham had cast his imperial mantle over responsible government.

When responsible government was finally conceded the vogue of Lord Durham's *Report* is easily understood. The experiment in the Canadas may have been the most critical and decisive factor in colonial policy, but once conceded the "great principle" belonged to the whole empire, and the great *Report* became the gospel of the new order for British provinces in every quarter of the world. It was as appropriate for New Zealand and the Australian provinces as for New Brunswick and Prince Edward Island. Sixty years later its classic phrases found their way into "the fight for responsible government" in the North-West Territories of the Canadian West. Much of this veneration, as we have seen, was unhistorical. In the life of nations a great tradition may be a fact even if it is not founded upon fact. But in the Durham tradition, his courage, his spectacular mission, his untimely death, his protracted vindication, were facts and not fiction; and Durham's *Report* remained and remains the epitome of responsible government.

Did Durham contemplate responsible government as we understand it today? It is very doubtful. His speech in the house of lords (July 26, 1839) after his return from Canada is not convincing.¹¹ Sydenham who had several long consultations with Durham before leaving England maintained that it was Durham's system he introduced into Canada, and if there is anything certain

¹¹"He did not say that he would proceed immediately to the construction of such a government, or that he would take Ministers from the House of Assembly, and so form a responsible government, but he did say that if they gave to the Canadian people all the freedom which they themselves enjoyed as to representative institutions—if they gave them the power of regulating their own affairs, of voting money, and of refusing the supplies—if they gave them all these powers and yet denied to them the results of that freedom, or of those powers, it was impossible to imagine that there would be satisfaction in the colony" (July 26, 1839, *Hansard*, 3rd series, XLIX, 880).

about the Russell-Sydenham régime it is that it was intended to short-circuit the whole function of party and cabinet government by means of specious coalitions. The governor was to govern; his executive council was "a useful engine in the hands of the governor." These "placemen" as Sydenham calls them, were to be in the assembly as "instruments within its walls" in order to "defend his Acts or his policy."¹² As an antidote to opposition the heads of parties or factions were to be included in the executive council in neutralizing proportions. The one thing that was "inadmissible" (I am quoting from Sydenham to Russell himself) was that "the governor should take the advice of his ministers and be bound by it." It was only when these specious coalitions had broken down, when disciplined political parties refused office altogether until their leaders could accept it as a homogeneous cabinet, that responsible government as we now understand it was won in 1848. Lord Durham's conception of Canadian parties in 1839 seems to have been a dominant English-speaking majority (including the Tory merchants of Montreal) and a solid French minority.

Did Lord Durham forecast the scope of responsible government or its sovereign function in the integration of the Commonwealth? Here again a dubitative answer. Self-government *plus* union equals nationhood; and Durham's glimpse of "something like a national existence"—"some nationality of his own" for the North American colonist—is one of the most discerning prophecies of the *Report*. But the functions which Durham reserved for imperial control, "the constitution of the form of government,—the regulation of foreign relations, and of trade with the mother country, the other British colonies, and foreign nations,—and the disposal of the public lands," comprised eighty per cent, I suppose, of all the attributes of nationhood. His chief specific for imperial integration, as we have seen, was the glittering array of imperial administration. The therapeutic function of freedom to engender goodwill and co-operation in this wicked world is an incandescent faith in the philosophy of Burke and Howe and Buller and Elgin. "Devotion to great ideals of peace and freedom," said Balfour, "that is the bond. . . . If that is not enough nothing else is enough." This is the "communion of the spirit," in Burke's political philosophy, which was to transform the second empire

¹²Cf. Durham's statement in the *Report*, 279: "the Colonial Governor to be instructed to secure the co-operation of the Assembly in his policy, by entrusting its administration to such men as could command a majority."

into the commonwealth and change the whole basis of its unity. Daunted by the official repudiation of responsible government and obsessed by the immediate necessity of carrying the union, of liquidating French nationality in Canada, and of organizing the imperial administration of the public lands, Durham's mind seems to have remained at the last clouded with uncertainty. The serene faith which Buller infused into his last letter to him is the comfort of a physician for a wounded spirit—a spirit that was wounded unto death. The real heroes of great causes are those who do not live to see the bow of promise in the background of the receding storm. Durham's death before the dawn adds a touch of dedication and of sacrifice to a role already heroic in the achievement of the Commonwealth.

VI

At Durham's death, Sir John Cam Hobhouse, afterwards Lord Broughton, probably his closest friend in the Melbourne cabinet, wrote a true word about him in his diary: "In his intercourse with his friends he was by no means overbearing. . . . In fact he did not attach so much value to his character or opinions as to give himself a sufficient amount of self-confidence in matters of importance." Broughton adds one sovereign attribute, however, which shines like a beacon in the murky atmosphere of early Victorian politics: "He had an abundance of political courage."

Has any statesman in our history ever essayed so wide a range of constructive statesmanship? Race, self-government, federation, settlement and public lands, nationhood, these have been the greatest problems in Canadian history, and Lord Durham tried to solve them all in six months. Lord Morley at the end of a long life in intimate association with Gladstone, Joseph Chamberlain, and Asquith, once hazarded the opinion that the rarest gift of statesmanship was simple courage. If that is true Lord Durham's statesmanship rises into sublimity.

Broughton, it is true, added a qualification which was both sympathetic and just: "He had an abundance of political courage a little approaching to rashness." It would be easy to apply this qualification to many aspects of the *Report*. The public domain of the United States had been the most important single ingredient in the unity and expansion of the republic. Durham's appropriation from Gibbon Wakefield of another such imperial vision, the ample appanage set aside, as he thought, by God and Nature for

the British Empire, may have been an act of sublime courage in 1838, but for North America at least it was already fading into a mirage. Durham's forecast for the French race in this country may safely be attributed to rashness rather than to courage; and unlike so many of his major recommendations this is traceable, in its origin as well as in its exposition, to Lord Durham himself. Roebuck's scheme of federal union never found its way, fortunately, into the *Report*. But if Lord Durham's courage in appropriating responsible government in defiance of Lord John Russell's resolutions and of Melbourne's own official repudiation was "a little approaching to rashness," it was the sort of rashness which is indistinguishable, at this distance, from consummate statesmanship.

No British official, however lowly in rank, had ever dared to avow this revolutionary principle before the Durham mission. No British official ever brought such rank and power to the British provinces as Durham brought in 1838, and he had the courage to stake his political life—perhaps it would not be too much to say life itself—upon that issue. He did not live to see the manner of its vindication. For seven long years British colonial secretaries, three of whom lived to become prime ministers,¹³ were deaf alike to Durham's *Report*, to Howe's four *Letters*, and to Charles Buller's *Responsible government for colonies*. It is now clear that imperial advocacy and empirical statesmanship were alike indispensable for the great achievement. Seven days, we read, they compassed the walls of the city, and the seventh day they compassed the city seven times; and the walls of the city fell when the trumpets sounded and the people shouted with a great shout. It may have been the shout that brought down the walls of Jericho so that the people went up into the city, every man straight before him; but among all who blew with the trumpets first place must go to Lord Durham for the courage, the dignity, the noble diction, of his great *Report*. Without compromising the canons of historical scholarship we have tried in these commemorative lectures to honour his name and to demonstrate anew the fulfilment of the faith in which he died that Canada would one day do justice to his memory.

CHESTER MARTIN

The University of Toronto.

¹³Lord John Russell, Stanley (Lord Derby), and Gladstone.

NOTES AND DOCUMENTS

EXTRACTS FROM GLADSTONE'S PRIVATE POLITICAL DIARY TOUCHING CANADIAN QUESTIONS IN 1840

SHORTLY after W. E. Gladstone entered politics he began keeping a political diary or journal in which he recorded his observations concerning men and measures, summaries of private discussions, and his own reflections upon issues which then seemed of special importance. He continued this intermittently for about ten years. The judgments are those of a conservative and brilliant young man, who at an early age was admitted to the inner council of his party. This political diary is, therefore, important for the light which it sheds upon the organization and strategy of the Conservative party under the leadership of Sir Robert Peel, the private opinion of Peel and other Conservative leaders, and the political ideas which Gladstone held at a time when he was considered the hope of the stern and unbending Tories.

In the years 1837-41, as may be learned from the pages of *Hansard* and from published correspondence, memoirs, and biographies, Canada and Canadian questions attracted much attention. The Rebellion of 1837, the mission of Lord Durham and his famous report, the work of C. Poulett Thomson (Lord Sydenham), and the various plans for settling Canadian problems called forth a great deal of private and public discussion. Some of the former were summarized by Gladstone in this journal which is labelled *Black leather book of political memoranda*¹ and from which extracts are given below. Of special biographical interest are Gladstone's views on colonial self-determination.

PAUL KNAPLUND

The University of Wisconsin.

[Entry under date of June 9, 1840.]

I conversed on the morning of this day with the Bishop of Nova Scotia (Inglis)² on the Clergy Reserves & on Colonial Government. He advocates the maintaining with a high hand the perpetuity of British connection, the general ascendancy of the party attached to it, & most of all, of a British *will* in the government of the Colonies, to form & controul the Colonial will. I expressed to him my differing from his views : in language substantially to this effect or to the effect

¹The bound manuscript from which the extracts have been transcribed is found among the *Gladstone papers* in the British Museum. A few selections have been printed in Morley, *Gladstone*, I, 641-2 and in *The Gladstone papers* (London, 1930), 20-6; but the greater part of this valuable journal awaits publication.

²John Inglis, Bishop of Nova Scotia, 1825-50.

of a comment on this text. Consider first the Reform Bill & the immense changes which this period has introduced into the principles & practice of home government. Secondly the composition of society in the Colonies. Thirdly the want of concurrence with us among the loyal party in the most essential of all our principles: namely that of State religion—which actually deprives us of a basis wherein to build. All these things considered I arrive at the following conclusions. It is our true wisdom to see & know our circumstances with their *potentialities* these are the materials with which a man is to work. I think them to be as follows: we cannot mould colonial destinies against colonial will (in this class of colonies, found of free settlers): we cannot save loyal Houses of Assembly from the consequences of their own erroneous desires: we cannot maintain the friends of British connection if they are greatly exceeded in numbers or weight or activity or in the sum of them, by their enemies: we can possibly hold up our heads above water at home against the enemies of true British principles—we can even possibly lend, & will to the utmost of our power cheerfully lend, you some aid in maintaining the contest in the colony: but the issue of the contest must mainly & ultimately depend much more upon yourselves than upon us. Of course there are matters to be handled with reserve: & only so far developed as may suffice to rouse the energies of those on whose activity we must considerably rely. . . .

Tonight I have conversed a good deal with Sir Francis Head³ & with Lord Seaton⁴ on the Union: & a fortnight ago I had a very long conversation on Canadian matters with the latter. He disapproves of the Union:⁵ says it will bring an unmanageable assembly, & accelerate the separation, I agree. Yet I am much inclined to doubt whether, unless led by the Duke of Wellington—or even if then—he will record his vote against it.⁶ He would have continued the present Govt. in L. Canada for a time until men's minds were mollified, wh. he thinks might have been done by measures on which all are agreed & by lenient administration.

Sir Francis Head looks at matters keenly but solely from his own point of view. He says why did not the one party or the other take up Lieut. Drew⁷—I say we as opposition cannot compel the Crown to behave well to its own servants, even when we may think the case pretty clear. He says why not thank the people of Upper Canada for what they did. I apprehend great anomalies & inconveniences would arise from the introduction of such a practice. He says you must not adopt the will of the people as your principle: if I had done so when I went to U. Canada I

³As lieutenant-governor of Upper Canada, 1835-8, Head's part in upholding the family compact, and contributing to the outbreak of the rebellion, is well known.

⁴First Baron Seaton, 1778-1863. As Sir John Colborne he had been lieutenant-governor of Upper Canada, 1829-36; commander-in-chief of the military forces in Canada, 1835-9; and acting governor-general, during the interim between the departure of Lord Durham, Nov., 1838, and the arrival of C. Poulett Thomson, later Lord Sydenham, Oct., 1839. In a letter to Lord John Russell, Jan. 18, 1840, Thomson called Seaton "the worst civil Governor that ever ruled this country" (*Letters from Sydenham* ed. Paul Knaplund, London, 1931, 41).

⁵But in conversations with Thomson, Colborne, as he then was, had expressed himself strongly in favour of the union. "He considers the Union," wrote Thomson to Russell, Oct. 22, 1839, "the best plan to adopt & that it is popular in the lower Province except with some of the moderate French party and the Priests" (*ibid.*, 34).

⁶The surmise was correct. In the house of lords, Seaton confessed he had been alarmed over the probable effects of the union of the Canadas, but declared in favour of it (*Hansard*, ser. 3, LIV, 505-6).

⁷Later Admiral Drew, 1792-1878. He had settled in Upper Canada, 1834, was appointed senior naval officer in the province, and commanded the party which destroyed the *Caroline*, Dec., 1837. On account of this exploit he became very unpopular among the radicals. Attempts on his life caused him to leave Canada in 1842.

should have failed. I said you successfully evoked the will of the people agst. a disloyal Assembly : & that loyal will so evoked demands the Union. He replied that they were worried or cajoled into it : that two years ago when cool they were against it : that the Queen's Message, the Govr., the Ministry, led them into it.—I say we cannot lead the destinies of Canada for good against the errors of our friends. It is matter I believe of sheer impossibility. If the Assembly will follow the ministers, how can you expect us, who are unable to overthrow the ministers, to resist both.

June 14. Meeting at Sir R. Peel on Clergy Reserves.⁸

When the leader [i.e. Sir Robert Peel] has no particular course to advise nor any particular course to deprecate, he generally invites all those whom he summons to declare their opinions before he says anything : but if there be anyone line of action which he wishes to prevent, then without giving out his own positive opinion, he generally opens the proceedings by strongly stating the objections to that particular line. Today he was much afraid of an adverse decision on the Canada Clergy Reserves' Bill & was therefore most desirous to avoid dividing against it : the reason of his fear being that such an occurrence would break the whole force & effect of the favourable votes on Irish Registration which we have had & will expect to have.⁹

I do not think he had thought much on the merits of this question, distracted as his attention is by a thousand others; or on the principles of a safe settlement respecting it.

Stanley¹⁰ . . . thought that we should secure by Imperial Act the portions intended to be given to or rather retained by the established Churches of England & Scotland & remit the residue to the absolute disposal of the Canadian Legislature. This I think an excellent idea : but I would combine with it the further principle: that the residue must be only such as is surrendered by those who are empowered to act for & represent the claims arising under the Act of 1791 : I said so.

The principle which Stanley has thus shadowed out & which Peel I think approved has dwelt in my mind for many years past with a growing belief that it is the right guide for our colonial policy in matter of religion : namely to restrict the action, the influence, the example, of the Home Government, as respects religion within the colonies, to those principles which are acted upon in the mother country, and with reference to anything which is beyond them, to make it purely permissive.

Follett¹¹ thought the Judges by their opinion intended to admit the claim of all Protestant bodies having anything like a regular ministry.

⁸In a famous letter to Russell, Jan. 18, 1840, C. Poulett Thomson described the Reserves as "the one great overwhelming grievance—the root of all the troubles of the Province—the cause of the Rebellion—the never failing watchword at the hustings—the perpetual source of discord, strife and hatred" (*Letters from Sydenham*, 42). The bill in question had been drawn up by Thomson and accepted by the legislature of Upper Canada; but since it had to be passed as an imperial statute, it was revised and introduced in the house of commons by Lord John Russell, the colonial secretary, May 28; it passed the second reading, June 15; and the third reading, July 29, 1840. Peel abstained from voting in the divisions (*Hansard*, ser. 3, LIV, 701, 1201; LV, 1104).

⁹The reference is to the Registration of Voters (Ireland) Bill, then before the house of commons (see *Hansard*, ser. 3, LIV).

¹⁰Lord Stanley, later Earl of Derby, colonial secretary, 1833-4, 1841-5, and three times prime minister.

¹¹Sir William W. Follett, solicitor-general in the government of Peel, 1834-5. The opinion referred to was summarized by Lord John Russell in the house of commons, July 6, 1840 (*Hansard*, ser. 3, LV, 464).

Graham¹² was very desirous of a total sale of the lands & of drawing all the Proceeds into investments on this side the water, in the Public Funds. (June 20). On Saturday from 12 to 3 I was at Sir R. Peel's : most of the time was spent in discussing Clergy Reserves. The Archbishop was present & read his proposition.¹³ Peel was for delay until the commencement of next Session in order to have communication with the organs of the Church of Scotland. He seemed much more than Stanley to make a point of leaving to the Colonial Assembly the disposal of any portion of the lands which might not be appropriated to or retained by the two Establishments. They differed on the question of sale with the Archbishop.

June 22. At Sir Robert Peel's this day we got through the consideration of five points to be included in a settlement of the Canada Reserves question.

1. That the titles to the existing Rectories should be confirmed.
2. That the present actual receipts of the Churches of England & Scotland should be guaranteed to them respectively as a minimum (Stanley's proposition).
3. That the monies already received & receivable under the act of the 7 & 8 Geo. IV, should be divided between the Churches of England & Scotland in the proportions of 2 : 1.
4. That the residue of lands should be sold.
5. That the proceeds should be divided as follows :
 To the Churches of England & Scotland by Imperial Act (as 2 : 1 . . . left blank)¹⁴
 The remainder not to be appropriated by Imperial Act, but to be surrendered.
 (My decision under (5) must be with consent of the two Establishments, through their best organs, the best that can be had.)
 The points remaining for consdr. are
 - a. To fill up the blank in (5)
 - b. To determine to what party the surrender should be made.
 - c. To limit the terms & rules of sale, & mode of payment.
 - d. To consider of future reservations under 31 Geo. 1 [*sic*].

¹²Sir James Graham, 1792-1861, member of the government of Lord Grey, 1830-4, split with the Whigs on the Irish question, home secretary in Peel's government, 1841-6.

¹³Possibly the one referred to by Lord John Russell in the house of commons, June 15, 1840 (*Hansard*, ser. 3, LIV, 1201).

¹⁴These were somewhat modified and then accepted by the government (*ibid.*, LIV, 463-9).

REVIEW ARTICLE

CANADA AND FOREIGN AFFAIRS¹

FIVE years ago the CANADIAN HISTORICAL REVIEW first undertook an annual review of the literature on foreign affairs, in so far as it affected Canada. The trend of subsequent events has justified this decision since it has become increasingly clear that the relations of Canada with the rest of the world are such that actions even in remote countries may seriously influence the course of Canadian history. Last September Canadians devoured their newspapers or sat by the radio, knowing that decisions taken in London, Paris, Prague, Rome, Moscow, or Munich might lead to a war in which this country was engaged, or, at best, to a changed balance of power in which the interests of the dominion were less assured than formerly. The Munich crisis became a part of Canadian history. We continue to live in the midst of world crises, and in such a situation it is not easy to draw a line between those books which bear directly enough on Canadian history to be included in this article and those which do not. Decisions must be arbitrary. Manifestly, one cannot trace back indefinitely the roots of present problems, but the peace conference seems to form a reasonable starting-point. Nor is it feasible to mention all the recently published books on the topics considered to be relevant; an attempt has been made to select significant publications which provide sufficient information and variation in point of view for any purpose other than specialized study. The boundaries of the subject covered by this article will, therefore, remain little changed from those of previous years. Imperial relations, as such, will not be considered, since the CANADIAN HISTORICAL REVIEW also publishes annually a review article on that subject.

While it can hardly be disputed that world affairs have assumed a growing importance for Canada, the tale of writing by Canadians is a brief one; but there is every reason to believe that this is no indication of lack of interest. One of the few books by Canadians, F. R. Scott's *Canada today*, forms a bridge between domestic and external affairs. Its purpose is "to describe the principal economic, political and social factors which determine Canada's national interest and outlook, to distinguish the various schools of opinion within the country, and particularly to show the relation between internal forces and external policy." After describing briefly the leading internal factors—of geography, population, economics, political parties and issues—the author turns to the connections of Canada with the outside world, both in respect of facts and of policies. No attempt is made to gloss over the fact that various groups of Canadians think so differently about foreign affairs that the unity of the country may hinge on foreign policy, just as its economy—at least in its present condition—is dependent on foreign trade. Mr. Scott's arguments are reasoned but he does not hide his own preferences, for example in regard to the establishment of the legal right to neutrality. If he is at times provocative, he is always stimulating.

Turning to the outside world by which Canada today cannot but be affected, the reader will find some additions to the general studies of the period since the war. Professor Seton-Watson's *Britain and the dictators* has as a sub-title, *A survey of post-war British policy*. As such it is welcome, but it is doubly welcome in that it is also descriptive of the main post-war developments and issues. Each of the

¹This is the fifth annual review article on this subject published in the June issue of the CANADIAN HISTORICAL REVIEW. For the bibliography of this article see page 209.

three chapters on relations with Russia, Italy, and Germany—which together form half the book—gives an account of the rise of a dictatorship and its character. The volume throughout is based on wide knowledge, and is forceful but sane in interpretation. For the subjects that it covers, no better guide can be found. William Orton's *Twenty years' armistice* is a mixture of history and good journalism. Intended, apparently, more for the general reader than the student, it gives a picture which is always readable, necessarily incomplete, and sometimes open to criticism in its interpretation. *Foreign affairs, 1919-1937*, by E. L. Hasluck, adds little to the literature of the subject. It lacks the brightness which might have covered its factual errors, and in the section on the United States commits those sins of superciliousness and ignorance which are happily becoming more rare in European writers. The revised edition of G. M. Gathorne-Hardy's *Short history of international affairs*, is considerably enlarged (by about 130 pages). It is little changed in the period up to 1930, but from 1930 to 1938 is either new or re-cast. Like the first edition, the second is one of the best books on the subject. Clear, concise, and informative, it is written with calm temper; but there is no attempt to avoid judgments, which are expressed at times with firmness.

Other guides of value have recently been issued. *A sketch-map history of the Great War and after*, by Irene Richards and others, is intended, apparently, for schools, but may well be used by older students. It consists of concise text accompanied by a large number of maps. The break-up of the Austrian empire, for example, is explained by three pages of text and four maps: political, population, races, and economic. A. B. Keith's *Speeches and documents on international affairs, 1918-1937*, is a new collection that forms a valuable reference book. It covers a wide range of subjects from the fourteen points to non-intervention in Spain. For the events of 1937 readers may refer to the annual volume of documents published by the Royal Institute of International Affairs, entitled *Documents on international affairs* and edited by Stephen Heald. The volume for 1937 contains documents illustrating the foreign policies of the United Kingdom and of a number of other states, both in Europe and elsewhere. Another useful reference book is the current edition of the *Political handbook of the world*, edited by W. H. Mallory for the Council on Foreign Relations, and showing, for each country, the composition of the government, programmes and leaders of political parties, a list of principal newspapers with political affiliations and names of editors. It ends with a section on the League of Nations. The latter may also be studied in more detail in a new edition of the booklet, *Essential facts about the League of Nations*, published by the information section of the league.

Many journalists have, in the last few years, provided the public with the results of their observations of Europe at first hand. Such books have, in varying degrees, obvious advantages and disadvantages. While creating the atmosphere which the analytical or historical works frequently lack, they run the danger of being self-consciously readable, and of piling on effects for a reader whose general knowledge may be unable to bear the strain without distortion. Douglas Reed's *Disgrace abounding* is an honest revolt against a British foreign policy with which he violently disagrees. It is informative on people and atmosphere in south-eastern Europe rather than on issues. It will please some readers and repel others because of its hectic, sometimes shrill, style, and its repetition of ideas. Bruce Lockhart in *Guns or butter* gives an account of his travels in Scandinavia and south-eastern Europe. He arrived in Vienna just after the German occupation, in Prague just before it, and in Berlin in the spring. The Balkan states, he believes, have been rapidly changing and merit careful study. In all the countries which he discusses he met people and saw places of interest, and his accounts are good

reading. His is still, of course, the technique of the journalist, with studies of cases more than general deductions or analysis. Sisley Huddleston, in *In my time*, finds much to deplore and little to commend. One cannot but sympathize with a convinced individualist who finds the world gone mad since the war, but many of his condemnations are unreasonably sweeping and take too little account of factors which explain, if they do not defend, the actions of individuals.

Almost all issues of the post-war period lead back at least to the settlement after the war. While a number of books, large and small, have been written about that settlement, there have remained great gaps—both in specialized studies and general treatment. As the period of the making of the treaties has receded, it has become possible to regard the treaties with more knowledge and more detachment. Books published in the past year have done not a little to improve the literature of the subject. J. W. Wheeler-Bennett's *Brest-Litovsk*, written with a rare combination of scholarship and readability, gives not only the first serious study of that treaty, but also serves to balance the German view that Versailles was a particularly bad example of a dictated treaty. It is probable that the history of peacemaking will in future be seen to begin with the treaties of Brest-Litovsk and Bucharest, the character and terms of both of which affected the settlement of 1919. In many ways Lloyd George's *The truth about the peace treaties* is the most important contribution by an individual to the history of the Paris conference. Written by one of the principal actors, it is not, and could not be expected to be, detached; but it is highly informative and always interesting. Not the least valuable part of the book consists in the frequent and long quotations from documents, especially from the minutes of the British Empire delegation and of various committees. All the main aspects of the treaties are covered in some detail, and a spirited defence, which cannot easily be dismissed, is made of Lloyd George's own position. For students of Canadian history there are several passages of direct value. Lloyd George wanted to have a delegation from the bolshevik government, and in this he was supported by Sir Robert Borden. When a policy toward Russia was discussed in the British Empire delegation Borden made it clear that Canada would not continue to maintain troops in that country, and advocated negotiation. As already known, the dominions opposed the mandate system, though they were later induced to accept it. Lloyd George then regretted that Canada would not consider taking a mandate herself, and suggested as an alternative that she might "undertake the control and administration of the British West Indian Islands on behalf of the Empire," but Borden apparently was unwilling to consider the plan. A further passage records the discussions by British ministers and the dominion prime ministers of the reply to the German note on the Treaty of Versailles, and the comments made on the wisdom of parts of the treaty.

The early part of the second volume of Sir Robert Borden's *Memoirs* also covers the conference of Paris. There is a good deal of information on Canadian representation at the conference and in the League of Nations, but surprisingly little on aspects of the settlement in which Lloyd George's book shows that Canada played a part. One would have liked to know more, for example, of the projected cession of the Alaska pan-handle to Canada in exchange for territory in the Caribbean. On the whole, Borden's book is disappointing on foreign policy, for its author played a leading role in a period in which important changes were made and decisions reached, and it might have been expected that he would write at some length of the peace conference and its results.

Three other volumes contribute to the history of the conference. *At the Paris peace conference* is James T. Shotwell's diary, prefaced by a "retrospect" on the

American experts, the conference, and the treaties. The diary itself gives contemporary impressions of affairs as they unrolled, and especially in regard to the labour sections of the treaties, with which the author was particularly concerned. The other two works are monographs on the settlement in respect of two of the countries whose disputed claims raised major issues of principle. *Italy at the Paris peace conference*, by René Albrecht-Carrié, is a scholarly and definitive study beginning with the negotiations leading up to the Treaty of London, and following the course of the conference, in so far as it affected Italy, in considerable detail. It is fully documented both in the text and appendices, but the main argument is always lucid. There are excellent maps. The Italian claims formed one of the main cases of the old *versus* the new diplomacy, and finally led Wilson to sacrifice his general principles for the sake of the League of Nations. Almost exactly the same issue was raised by the rival claims of Japan and China in respect of the German rights in Shantung. The story of this, beginning with the outbreak of the war, is told in T. E. La Fargue's *China and the World War*. Heavily documented, as is the volume on Italy, La Fargue's work is less easy to follow, but is nevertheless essential to a study of the settlement. Wilson was the main hope of the Chinese, but again was obliged to withdraw from his original position. The Chinese were, in the end, wholly unsuccessful in their contention, a failure which the author attributes in part to the resistance to the mandate system. "It began to look," he writes, "as if the Japanese delegates had merely to sit quietly by while Hughes and Massey and Clemenceau established by inference the Japanese case for them." If Wilson abandoned his principles in these two cases, he had full hope that the league, for which he made so many sacrifices, would prove to be a *deus ex machina* in the future.

The pursuit of independent national interests did not end with the Paris conference. The principal developments in succeeding years in international affairs have centred first around the attempt to maintain and work out the settlement, and then the collapse of that régime in the period since 1931. Internationalism gave way to nationalism, hope of free trade to closed economies; treaties have been torn up, and boundaries changed beyond recognition. The causes of such radical changes are many, and the results may be seen in various areas of the world. In point of time, and perhaps in point of importance, the first national policy to be examined must be that of the United States. D. F. Fleming, in *The United States and world organization, 1920-1933*, describes in scathing terms the opposition to the covenant of the league, which he sees as a party move. In the separate peace made with Germany the American government, he thinks, tried to get the advantages of the Treaty of Versailles without its obligations. The Harding administration at first would not even reply to letters from Geneva; but gradually contact with the league was established by various means, and co-operation became regular by 1929. Then came more active co-operation, particularly in the disarmament conference of 1932, for the failure of which Fleming puts part of the blame on the United States. He devotes a long chapter to Manchuria, and turns to an analysis of American public opinion toward the league after the league had delivered its verdict. In his view the United States should never have attempted isolation after the war: and cannot hope in the future to keep free from the balance of power, because she is the balance. In his life of *Elihu Root*, Philip Jessup goes over some of the same ground, but is less critical of the opponents of the unamended covenant. Yet Root, he says, lived to regret America's abstention, though at the time, he was one of those who was critical of the commitments made by the covenant.

In both of the last-mentioned books attention is given to the Washington

conference and relations in the far east. There are also a number of recent studies devoted entirely to the far east, where the first armed resistance to the settlement took place. *The far east*, by H. S. Quigley and G. H. Blakeslee, is an historical account of the development of the present situation. Beginning before 1931, the book goes into detail on the conditions of Manchuria and the course of the crisis of 1931. There are useful chapters on treaty rights, tariffs, and customs administration in China, and on the position of the great powers and their policies in the far east. T. A. Bisson's *Japan in China* is also an historical work, beginning in 1933 and ending with the spring of 1938. It is sympathetic toward China, but not aggressively so. The matter is carefully gleaned and informative, but is presented in a manner that makes it not easy to follow. Miss Freda Utley's *Japan's gamble in China* is frankly partisan. Japan is to her a backward country, oppressed by the plutocracy and the army, and militaristic in its policy. Overpopulation she believes to be owing to backward conditions; and foreign conquest, she argues, will only make the rich richer. The book is lively and the points are clearly made throughout. Canada is a Pacific country, and for many years has had relations with Japan and China. In the political field this was most vividly demonstrated by the attitude of the Canadian government toward the Anglo-Japanese alliance. In regard to the problem of emigration from crowded Japan and from China, Canada has had a special interest. In *The Japanese Canadians*, by Charles H. Young and Helen R. Y. Reid, will be found an analysis of migration of orientals to Canada, and its results, both in respect of the immigrants and of the country as a whole. The study gives particular attention to standards of living, differences in which lie at the base both of the cause of emigration and the Canadian attitude toward allowing entry of Japanese and Chinese. A second study of the relations of Canada with the far east is made in brief space in the report of a round table of the Canadian Institute of International Affairs, "Canada, the far east, and Europe," edited by R. G. Riddell. An account of the course of the war in China and its relations to the other powers will be found in Toynbee's *Survey of international affairs, 1937*, vol. I.

Armed resistance to the *status quo* was not for long confined to Japan, but became in the thirties a main theme of European affairs. The springs of conflict were numerous and varied. A good approach to the subject may be made by a reading of the documents collected by Michael Oakeshott in *The social and political doctrines of contemporary Europe*. Communism is described in extracts from the writings of Marx, Engels, and Lenin; fascism by passages from Mussolini and some laws of fascist Italy; national socialism is represented by the programme of the party at two periods, and by some later official documents. To show another point of view the editor has chosen encyclicals of two popes, Leo XIII and Pius XI; and representative democracy is described from the works of John Stuart Mill, de Tocqueville, Cobbett, Paine, T. H. Green, and Lincoln. To F. A. Voigt both communism and national socialism are comparable in many respects, and are both illogical. In *Unto Caesar* he examines both philosophies, with briefer reference to fascism. His ideas are stimulating, but his judgments incline to be extreme. In the days of the Weimar republic Germany was evolving a philosophy intended to combine individualism with state control, a movement thoroughly traced by Nathan Reich in *Labour relations in republican Germany*. The Third Reich replaced this growing process by totalitarianism. C. W. Guillebaud's *The economic recovery of Germany* is a much needed study of the National Socialist economic system. The author seeks to be impartial and objective—a rare aim in any approach to the "ideologies." His book is heavily factual, but is clearly organized and non-technical. The demands of Germany for colonies have been constant,

and have been defended on the ground of economic necessity. A pamphlet on *Germany's claim to colonies*, produced by the Royal Institute of International Affairs, is a concise account of German colonial policy before the war, the settlement made at Paris, the growth of the colonial movement in Germany, and the views held in Great Britain on German claims. A more elaborate study was also made of the question by a study group of the Institute of International Affairs, and published under the title, *The colonial problem*. It is divided into three parts: "The international aspect," "The colonial aspect," and "Investment, trade, finance and settlement." Within these divisions the subject is approached from a number of points of view, and full consideration is given to such controversial questions as access to raw materials and markets, as well as to less disputed questions of methods of administration and the conditions of the native populations.

Italy has been loud in her demands for colonial expansion since the settlement at Paris, so unsatisfactory to her in that respect. G. T. Garratt's *Mussolini's Roman empire* tells the story of the Italian adventures in Ethiopia and Spain. The author has no sympathy with the Italian point of view, and is highly critical of British policy. He holds that when conditions in Europe became favourable to Italian imperialism, Ethiopia was selected as the safest and most desirable objective. His account of Ethiopia, in comparison with similar civilizations, is interesting. Garratt then turns to Spain. His description of that country is unflattering to the conservative forces, and his criticisms of non-intervention equally sweeping. A fuller and more balanced account of the Spanish war, both in its purely Spanish and in its international aspects, will be found in Toynbee's *Survey of international affairs, 1937*, the whole of the second volume of which is devoted to Spain. The subject is taken under three headings: "The Spanish background of the war in Spain," "The course of the war in Spain," and "The powers and the war." Like all the *Surveys*, this is scholarly and thoughtful. *Italy's foreign and colonial policy, 1914-1937*, by M. H. H. Macartney and Paul Cremona, is an important contribution and fills a long-standing gap. The volume begins with an analysis of the principles of Italian policy, emphasizing the importance of the Mediterranean. An account of Italy at the peace conference is followed by a series of chapters on relations with individual countries, with treaty revisions, disarmament, the League of Nations, and colonial expansion. It ends, as it began, by stating that Italy is expansionist and seeks supremacy in the Mediterranean.

The war in Spain and the conquest of Ethiopia would alone have turned the powers toward the Mediterranean, but there have been further issues in that area caused by the partition of part of the old Turkish empire. In *The Arab awakening* George Antonius tells the story of the Arab national movement from the middle of the nineteenth century. The war opened the way for the overthrow of Turkish rule and the creation of new states. Antonius describes the settlement at the peace conference, and goes on to the history of the Arabian peninsula, and of Iraq, Syria, and Palestine. In places he is highly critical of Great Britain and the other powers concerned, accusing them of violation of principles and agreements. On the other hand, he pays tribute to British statesmanship in Iraq. In regard to Palestine he recognizes the difficulties created by partisan literature and propaganda, and puts the Arab case in moderate but firm terms. The only solution, he believes, is an independent Arab state, having a treaty with Great Britain protecting British strategic and economic interests and minorities and minority rights. W. B. Ziff's *The rape of Palestine* is an example of partisan literature. It does not face the Arab claims in Palestine, and is bitter and one-sided to such a degree as to destroy its own purpose as well as the genuine historical matter it contains.

While the problems of Palestine still awaited settlement, the centre of interest in international affairs turned to south-eastern Europe. The "liquidation" of the Treaty of Versailles by Germany, her economic drive to the south-east, and the condition of the Danubian countries are outlined in the *Survey of international affairs*. For factual information in that area, the reader may turn to a series of pamphlets issued by the International Studies Conference, chronologies of political and economic events from 1918 to 1938. Bulgaria, Yugoslavia, Czechoslovakia, Austria, and Hungary have thus been covered. Austria and Czechoslovakia, as the first objects of German territorial expansion, have been much to the fore in recent literature. "Diplomaticus," in *The Czechs and their minorities*, argues that Czechoslovakia was wrongly constructed to include large minorities, and that they have been badly treated. Bertram de Colonna's *Czecho-Slovakia within* follows much the same line, but is more critical. He seeks to prove, in addition, that Bohemia had a predominantly German history. The most scholarly study of Czechoslovakia is *Czechs and Germans* by Miss Elizabeth Wiskemann, which is chiefly concerned with the long dispute between the two races, and their relationship after 1919. With some exceptions, she finds that the minorities were not oppressed. In *Fallen bastions* G. E. R. Gedye writes of the growth of reaction in Austria and the attack on the socialists. The murder of Dollfuss was soon followed by the withdrawal of Italian support, and Gedye believes that Schuschnigg could have saved his country's independence only by an alliance with the socialists. The author gives a grim and dramatic account of the Nazi invasion and terror. Expelled from Austria, he went to Prague, where he was to witness the destruction of the next bastion protecting southern Europe against German expansion. He writes bitterly of the "betrayal" of Czechoslovakia, and believes that the military position was not unfavourable for a stand against Hitler. R. W. Seton-Watson's *Munich and the dictators* is a sequel to his *Britain and the dictators*. He gives an admirably succinct account of the history of Austria and Czechoslovakia, and then devotes the principal part of a short book to the Munich crisis. Like Gedye, he is outspoken in his condemnation of British and French policy, and, like him, believes that the military situation was more favourable than it would be later, for the balance of power was destroyed. H. F. Armstrong's *When there is no peace* is a recital of the diplomacy leading up to the Munich settlement. There is an undercurrent of criticism of France and Great Britain, but put in moderate terms. Little attention is given to military considerations. Victor Cornea's *What next in Central Europe?* is a brief essay, written before the Munich crisis, and devoted to a study of attempted and possible solutions in the same area. André Tardieu's *L'année de Munich* consists of a number of notes written during 1938. The author is critical both of the domestic and foreign policies of France. He argues that Hitler was bluffing in September, and urges that Britain and France should set their houses in order and work together.

In Canada, as elsewhere, Munich was a crisis that affected her future as well as that of Europe. A white paper was published by the Canadian government entitled *Documents relating to the German-Czechoslovak crisis*. It consists of a number of letters and dispatches received from the British government, but no Canadian documents. The effects on public opinion are analysed in an article in the *Round table* for December, 1938, "Overseas reactions to the crisis"; and in the same issue there is a brief examination of "Foreign policy [of Canada] after Munich." A symposium of opinions contributed to the *Winnipeg tribune* is reprinted under the title, *After Munich: Where do we go from here?* On March 20 the prime minister made a statement in the house of commons on the German occupation of Czechoslovakia, and it was followed by a brief debate. The annexa-

tion of the Sudeten land, and later of Bohemia and Moravia, were only the most recent manifestations of a problem that cut deep into the post-war world. In the summer of 1937 the Geneva Institute of International Relations studied current trends, and published the results under the name of *Geneva and the drift to war*. Collective security is here seen to be breaking down. How may it be re-established? Should the League of Nations be reconstructed? And if so, on what lines? That the league itself was far from inactive may be seen in the official *Report on the work of the league, 1937-38*, and in the *Report of the Canadian delegates to the eighteenth assembly of the League of Nations*; but even its best friends were forced to see that its power to control political events had all but disappeared. The hopes of upholding liberalism and liberty through collective action run through the opinions of one of the most ardent spokesmen of that cause, Nicholas Murray Butler, whose speeches delivered in the years 1934-37 are gathered together under the title, *The family of nations*. Mrs. H. M. Swanwick, in *The roots of peace*, examines the reasons for the failure of the league, and finds defects in its general structure. Believing that the causes of war lie in human passions and interests, she turns to education as the only cure. The International Studies Conference, at its 1937 meeting, approached the problem from the point of view of *Peaceful change*. The study is based on the idea that pacts of non-aggression and mutual assistance cannot last if they ignore the necessity for change. To the end of seeing if change could be effected by peaceful means rather than by war, the conference examined questions of raw materials and markets, population, and colonies. The resulting volume gives both factual material and various points of view. Norman Angell's *Peace with the dictators?* begins with a series of imaginary statements by a German, an Italian, and an Englishman containing the points of view of their respective countries. Revision of the *status quo*, argues the author, is not the only key to peace, since there is a struggle for preponderance of power as well as for justice. Isolation for Britain he believes to be impracticable if she is to remain a great power. By retreating Britain has simply been getting weaker. But, "to defend ourselves we must defend law," and there must therefore be collective action, with force behind it. A different type of solution is found in *World reorganisation on corporative lines*, in which the author, Giuseppe de Michelis, wants to apply the Italian corporative system to the rest of the world. One result of such a plan would give Italy, as well as other countries, access to colonies and raw materials.

Less sweeping plans have been suggested for more co-operation between the United States and the British Commonwealth. The relations of the countries are examined in the report of a round table of the Canadian Institute of International Affairs, "The United States and the Commonwealth," by George Luxton. Particular attention is here given to the position of Canada. A volume entitled *Empire trade*, by W. H. Willson, is written from the standpoint that "political and economic co-operation between the various Dominions and Crown Colonies which form the British Empire is becoming increasingly important." There follow chapters with brief "market data" and other information on each unit of the Commonwealth. Another volume on a more limited field comes as the outcome of a study group of the Council on Foreign Relations, *Our trade with Britain*, by P. W. Bidwell. The work was undertaken to form a factual background for the Anglo-American trade treaty, then pending. It presents, in readable form, the facts of trade and tariff between the two countries, with a number of references to Canada. The chapters particularly on the tariff of each country from 1914 will continue to be of value. A debate on the trade agreement between Canada and the United States was initiated in the Canadian house of commons on February 14.

One of the most difficult and most human problems accentuated by the changed boundaries and "ideologies" has been that of refugees. J. H. Simpson's *The refugee problem* is based on a survey made by the Royal Institute of International Affairs. The volume is comprehensive, describing the movements from various countries and the conditions under which refugees may enter other states. Canada, of course, is concerned by being in the latter category. In *Aspects of modern international law* Sir John Fischer Williams writes in non-technical language of the international law of peace: what it is, and what it can and cannot do. International law has in the past brought about peaceful change, but in the present situation the author is cautious about the possibility (though not the desirability) of its effectiveness.

A conspicuous sign of changing conditions in the past few years has been the change from attempted disarmament to feverish armament. The story of the former is well told by Major-General A. C. Temperley in *The whispering gallery of Europe*. The author spent the years of the disarmament movement in Geneva as head of the League of Nations section of the war office. It is a good account, non-technical and detached. The whole book is written with good humour, but the criticisms are outspoken—of British policy as well as that of other countries. Increased armaments were begun before talk of disarmament was over. In Great Britain the government was slow to bring its defence forces to meet changing conditions, and was continually criticized by Winston Churchill. His speeches in the ten years from 1928, collected under the title, *Arms and the covenant*, are on the theme that neither the safety of the country nor the cause of collective security can be ensured without adequate defences. "Two things," he told the house of commons in 1936, "have staggered me after a long parliamentary experience. . . . The first has been the dangers that have so swiftly come upon us in a few years. . . . Second, I have been staggered by the failure of the House of Commons to react effectively against those dangers. . . ."

With the continued decay of the international situation have come a number of studies of the probable character of the next war. Some volumes have already been published in a series called *The next war*, edited by Liddell Hart. Each answers the questions that the average civilian asks; what lessons does the experience of the Great War teach? What has been the success of post-1918 weapons in China, Abyssinia, and Spain? What will be the probable use of these weapons in the next war? In the volume on *Sea power in the next war* Commander Russell Grenfell emphasizes the importance of submarines and destroyers, questions the continued value of the capital ship, and attempts to adjudge the effect of aircraft on naval activity. In *Tanks in the next war* Major Sheppard says that, while the tank has not lost its usefulness, the defence against it has become so effective that the tank is not likely to play a decisive part. J. M. Spaight writes the volume on *Air power in the next war*, and refuses to be put in the position of the extremists who would make all other weapons almost of no account. He believes that air power will be an important factor, but not the only one. Norman Macmillan regards air warfare as *The chosen instrument*. It is air attack alone that makes Great Britain vulnerable. He advocates some kind of concerted air defence, under which Canada, as the safest place, should be the arsenal. In spite of its title, Major-General Rowan-Robinson's *Imperial defence* is little concerned with anything but Britain and her trade-routes. He writes at length on the principles and practice of modern warfare, and finds that the defencelessness of London and the exposed position of Malta are the main threats of today. Harold Macmillan's essay, *Economic aspects of defence*, is an argument that Great Britain must attain economic efficiency by following, in some respects, methods adopted in Germany.

He suggests a single authoritative trade organization, rationalization of industry, and a ministry of supply.

Much of the matter in the above-mentioned books—for example on the probable use and effectiveness of air-power—applies to Canada as to other countries. For the Canadian position in particular the facts of existing defences will be found in the annual *Report* of the department of national defence. The plans and principles of Canadian armament are discussed in C. P. Stacey's article, "Canadian defence policy," in the *Canadian journal of economics and political science*. One aspect of Canadian defence is analysed by A. R. M. Lower in "The defence of the west coast." This, with other articles on defence, will be found in the *Canadian defence quarterly*. The Canadian house of commons devoted some time to various aspects of defence. A long debate on the Bren machine gun contract began on February 3, and a contract for war materials with a Montreal firm was debated on March 1. On March 10 the proposal to create a defence purchasing board was first discussed. The most important debate in the commons began on April 26, on supply for the department of national defence. The minister at that time made a lengthy and documented statement on the general lines of strategy, and the provision that was being made for the defence of the country.

At no time in the history of Canada have the dual problems of defence and foreign policy been so obviously important and so earnestly discussed. The lines of argument are familiar to all Canadians, and are admirably analysed in the first book mentioned in this review, F. R. Scott's *Canada today*. No better measure could be taken of the growing consciousness of the importance to Canada of foreign relations than the greatly increased attention given to the subject by parliament. Questions—too many to list here—were asked from time to time on various aspects of foreign affairs. Debates on trade relations and defence have already been mentioned. Beginning on March 30, there was an important debate on Canadian foreign policy, which lasted for four days. The prime minister began with a statement reviewing the European situation. He then turned to its effects on Canada, and from that to Canadian policy. He expressed himself as opposed both to definite commitments, and to the proposed plan for securing for Canada the right to legal neutrality in a war in which Great Britain was involved. He reiterated the government's stand that parliament must decide on what action was to be taken in case of a crisis. The leader of the Conservative opposition was generally in agreement, being opposed to legal neutrality and to conscription. Thus official Canadian foreign policy remains unchanged, and possesses both elastic and inelastic features. The implementing of that policy in the future is, more perhaps than ever, dependent on events in a disturbed world.

G. DET. GLAZEBOOK

The University of Toronto.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- After Munich: Where do we go from here?* Winnipeg: Winnipeg Tribune. 1938. Pp. 24. Contributors: EDWARD ANDERSON, NOEL BERNIER, JOHN BIRD, H. N. FIELDHOUSE, R. O. MACFARLANE, MURDOCK A. MACPHERSON, F. R. SCOTT, E. J. TARR, JOSEPH T. THORSON, FRANK H. UNDERHILL, WILLIAM ALLEN WHITE.
- ALBRECHT-CARRIÉ, RENÉ. *Italy at the Paris peace conference*. New York: Columbia University Press. 1938. Pp. xvi, 575. (\$5.25)
- ANGELL, NORMAN. *Peace with the dictators?: A symposium and some conclusions*. London: Hamish Hamilton [Toronto: Musson Book Co.]. 1938. Pp. 328. (\$2.50)
- ANTONIUS, GEORGE. *The Arab awakening: The story of the Arab national movement*. London: Hamish Hamilton [Toronto: Musson Book Co.]. 1938. Pp. 471. (\$4.50)
- ARMSTRONG, HAMILTON FISH. *When there is no peace*. New York: Macmillan Co. [Toronto: Macmillan Co. of Canada]. 1939. Pp. [viii], 236. (\$2.00)
- BIDWELL, PERCY WELLS. *Our trade with Britain: Bases for a reciprocal tariff agreement*. New York: Council on Foreign Relations. 1938. Pp. x, 129. (\$1.50)
- BISSON, T. A. *Japan in China*. New York: Macmillan Co. [Toronto: Macmillan Co. of Canada]. 1938. Pp. xii, 417. (\$3.35)
- BORDEN, HENRY (ed.). *Robert Laird Borden: His memoirs*. Introduction by ARTHUR MEIGHEN. 2 vols. Toronto: Macmillan Co. of Canada. 1938. Pp. xviii, 1061. (\$10.00 the set)
- BUTLER, NICHOLAS MURRAY. *The family of nations, its need and its problems: Essays and addresses*. New York, London: Charles Scribner's Sons. 1938. Pp. xiv, 400. (\$3.00)
- Canada, Department of national defence. *Report for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1937*. Ottawa: King's Printer. 1937. Pp. 122. (25c.)
- Canada, House of commons debates, session 1939. Official report, unrevised ed. Ottawa: King's Printer. 1939.
- Canada, Secretary of state for external affairs. *Documents relating to the German-Czechoslovak crisis, September, 1938*. Ottawa: King's Printer. 1938. Pp. 24. (10c.)
- Canadian Institute of International Affairs. *Report of the proceedings of the fifth annual conference, Ottawa, May 21st-22nd, 1938*. Toronto: The Institute. 1938. Pp. 66. (50c.) Contains the following articles: "The United States and the Commonwealth" by GEORGE LUXTON; "Canada, the far east, and Europe" by R. G. RIDDELL; "Problems of Canadian unity" by C. L. MONTEATH DOUGLAS.
- CHURCHILL, RANDOLPH S. (comp.). *Arms and the covenant: Speeches by Winston S. Churchill*. London: Harrap and Co. [Toronto: Oxford University Press]. 1938. Pp. 466. (\$5.00)
- The colonial problem: A report by a study group of members of the Royal Institute of International Affairs*. London: The Institute. 1937. Pp. xiv, 448. (21s.)
- COLONNA, BERTRAM de. *Czecho-Slovakia within*. London: Thornton Butterworth [Toronto: Thomas Nelson]. 1938. Pp. vi, 105. (\$1.50)
- CORNEA, VICTOR. *What next in Central Europe?: The problem of security and the indivisibility of peace*. Preface by the Rt. Hon. C. R. ATTLEE. Oxford: Shakespeare Head Press. 1938. Pp. viii, 71. (3s., 6d.)
- "DIPLOMATICUS." *The Czechs and their minorities*. London: Thornton Butterworth [Toronto: Thomas Nelson]. 1938. Pp. iv, 88. (\$1.50)
- FLEMING, DENNA FRANK. *The United States and world organization, 1920-1933*. New York: Columbia University Press. 1938. Pp. xiv, 569. (\$4.00)
- Foreign policy after Munich* (Round table, no. 113, Dec., 1938, 149-52).

- GARRATT, G. T. *Mussolini's Roman empire*. Ed. 4. Harmondsworth, Middlesex, Eng.: Penguin Books [Toronto: William Collins]. 1938. Pp. 254. (20c.)
- GATHORNE-HARDY, G. M. *A short history of international affairs, 1920 to 1938: Being the edition of 1934 revised and enlarged*. (Issued under the auspices of the Royal Institute of International Affairs.) London, Toronto: Oxford University Press. 1938. Pp. x, 487. (\$2.50)
- GEDYE, G. E. R. *Fallen bastions: The Central European tragedy*. London: Victor Gollancz. 1939. Pp. 519. (16s.)
- Geneva and the drift to war*. Based upon lectures given at the Geneva Institute of International Relations, August 1937, and is published for the committee of the institute. By various writers. (Problems of peace; twelfth series.) London: Allen and Unwin. 1938. Pp. xiv, 234. (\$2.50)
- GEORGE, DAVID LLOYD. *The truth about the peace treaties*. 2 vols. 1938. London: Gollancz [Toronto: Ryerson Press]. 1938. Pp. 735, 720. (\$6.00 each)
- Germany's claim to colonies*. (Information department papers, no. 23.) London: Royal Institute of International Affairs. 1938. Pp. 75. (2s.)
- GUILLEBAUD, C. W. *The economic recovery of Germany: From 1933 to the incorporation of Austria in March, 1938*. London: Macmillan and Co. [Toronto: Macmillan Co. of Canada]. 1939. Pp. xiv, 303. (\$3.50)
- HART, LIDDELL (ed.). *The next war: A series*. *Sea power in the next war* by RUSSELL GRENFELL; *Air power in the next war* by J. M. SPAIGHT; *Tanks in the next war* by E. W. SHEPPARD. London: Geoffrey Bles. 1938. Pp. viii, 184; x, 181; viii, 182. (5s. each)
- HASLUCK, E. L. *Foreign affairs, 1919-1937*. Cambridge University Press [Toronto: Macmillan Co. of Canada]. 1938. Pp. xviii, 347. (\$2.75)
- HEALD, STEPHEN. *Documents on international affairs, 1937*. (Issued under the auspices of the Royal Institute of International Affairs.) Oxford and Toronto: Oxford University Press. 1939. Pp. xxvii, 850. (42s.)
- HUDDLESTON, SISLEY. *In my time: An observer's record of war and peace*. London: Jonathan Cape [Toronto: Thomas Nelson]. 1938. Pp. 411. (\$3.75)
- International Studies Conference. *Chronology of political and economic events in the Danube basin, 1918-1936: Austria; Bulgaria; Czechoslovakia; Hungary; Yugoslavia*. Paris: International Institute of Intellectual Co-operation, League of Nations. 1938.
-
- Peaceful change: Procedures, population, raw materials, colonies. Proceedings of the tenth international studies conference, Paris, June 28th-July 3rd, 1937*. Paris: International Institute of Intellectual Co-operation, League of Nations. 1938. Pp. 685.
- JESSUP, PHILIP. *Elihu Root*. New York: Dodd, Mead and Co. 2 vols. 1938. Pp. xi, 563; vii, 586. (\$7.50)
- KEITH, ARTHUR BERRIEDALE (ed.). *Speeches and documents on international affairs, 1918-1937*. Vols. I and II. London: Oxford University Press. 1938. Pp. lvi, 290; x, 267.
- LA FARGUE, THOMAS EDWARD. *China and the World War*. (Hoover War Library publications, no. 12.) Stanford University, Calif.: Stanford University Press. London: Humphrey Milford. 1937. Pp. x, 278. (\$3.25)
- League of Nations. *Essential facts about the League of Nations*. Ed. 9 (rev.). Geneva: Information Section, League of Nations. 1938. Pp. 349.
-
- Report of the Canadian delegates to the eighteenth assembly of the League of Nations, Geneva, 13th September-6th October, 1937*. Ottawa: King's Printer. 1938. Pp. 26. (10c.)
-
- Report of the work of the league, 1937/38*. (Series of League of Nations publications; General, 1938. 4, 5.) Parts I and II. Geneva: League of Nations. 1938. Pp. 216; 92.

- LOCKHART, R. H. BRUCE. *Guns or butter*. Boston: Little, Brown [Toronto: McClelland and Stewart]. 1938. Pp. [vi], 439. (\$3.25)
- LOWER, A. R. M. *The defence of the west coast* (Canadian defence quarterly, XVI (1), Oct., 1938, 32-8).
- MACARTNEY, MAXWELL H. H. and CREMONA, PAUL. *Italy's foreign and colonial policy, 1914-1937*. London, Toronto: Oxford University Press. 1938. Pp. vii, 353. (\$3.00)
- MACMILLAN, HAROLD. *Economic aspects of defence*. London: Macmillan and Co. [Toronto: Macmillan Co. of Canada]. 1939. Pp. vi, 67. (35c.)
- MACMILLAN, NORMAN. *The chosen instrument*. London: John Lane. 1938. Pp. 168. (5s.)
- MALLORY, W. H. (ed.). *Political handbook of the world: Parliaments, parties and press as of January 1, 1938*. (Council on Foreign Relations.) New York: Harper. 1938. Pp. 210. (\$2.50)
- MICHELIS, GIUSEPPE de. *World reorganisation on corporative lines*. London: Allen and Unwin. 1935. Pp. 312. (5s.)
- OKESHOTT, MICHAEL. *The social and political doctrines of contemporary Europe*. Foreword by ERNEST BARKER. Cambridge University Press [Toronto: Macmillan Co. of Canada]. 1939. Pp. xxiv, 224.
- ORTON, WILLIAM. *Twenty years' armistice, 1918-1938*. New York: Farrar and Rinehart [Toronto: Oxford University Press]. 1938. Pp. xiv, 308. (\$2.75)
- Overseas reactions to the crisis* (Round table, no. 113, Dec., 1938, 28-57).
- QUIGLEY, HAROLD S. and BLAKESLEE, GEORGE H. *The far east: An international survey*. Boston: World Peace Foundation. 1938. Pp. x, 353. (Cloth, \$2.50; paper, 75c.)
- REED, DOUGLAS. *Disgrace abounding*. London: Jonathan Cape. 1939. Pp. 447. (10s., 6d.)
- REICH, NATHAN. *Labour relations in republican Germany: An experiment in industrial democracy, 1918-1933*. New York, Toronto: Oxford University Press. 1938. Pp. 293. (\$3.00)
- RICHARDS, IRENE, GOODSON, J. B., and MORRIS, J. A. *A sketch-map history of the Great War and after, 1914-1935*. London: Harrap and Co. [Toronto: Oxford University Press]. 1938. Pp. 136. (\$1.00)
- ROWAN-ROBINSON, H. *Imperial defence: A problem in four dimensions*. London: Frederick Muller. 1938. Pp. x, 342. (10s., 6d.)
- SCOTT, F. R. *Canada today: A study of her national interests and national policy*. Foreword by E. J. TARR. (Prepared for the British commonwealth relations conference, 1938; issued under the auspices of the Canadian Institute of International Affairs.) Ed. 2 rev. Toronto: Oxford University Press. 1939. Pp. xiv, 184. (\$1.25)
- *Le Canada d'aujourd'hui*. Preface par EDOUARD MONTPETIT. Montreal: 1939. Pp. xvi, 221. (\$1.00)
- SETON-WATSON, R. W. *Britain and the dictators: A survey of post-war British policy*. Cambridge University Press [Toronto: Macmillan Co. of Canada]. 1938. Pp. xviii, 460. (\$4.00)
- *Munich and the dictators: A sequel to "Britain and the dictators."* London: Methuen and Co. 1939. Pp. xii, 188. (5s.)
- SHOTWELL, JAMES T. *At the Paris peace conference*. New York: Macmillan Co. 1937. Pp. xii, 444. (\$4.50)

- SIMPSON, Sir JOHN HOPE. *The refugee problem: Report of a survey.* (Issued under the auspices of the Royal Institute of International Affairs.) London, New York, Toronto: Oxford University Press. 1939. Pp. 653. (\$10.00)
- STACEY, C. P. *Canadian defence policy* (Canadian journal of economics and political science, IV (4), Nov., 1938, 490-504).
- SWANWICK, H. M. *The roots of peace: A sequel to collective insecurity. Being an essay on some of the uses, conditions and limitations of compulsive force in the prevention of war.* London: Jonathan Cape [Toronto: Thomas Nelson]. 1938. Pp. 192. (\$1.00)
- TARDIEU, ANDRÉ. *L'année de Munich: Notes de semaine 1938.* Paris: Flammarion. 1939. Pp. 252. (18 fr. 50)
- TEMPERLEY, A. C. *The whispering gallery of Europe.* With a foreword by the Rt. Hon. ANTHONY EDEN. London: William Collins. 1938. Pp. 359. (15s.)
- TOYNBEE, ARNOLD J., assisted by BOULTER, V. M. *Survey of international affairs, 1937.* Vol. I; vol. II: *The international repercussions of the war in Spain (1936-7).* Oxford University Press. 1938. Pp. ix, 626; viii, 404. (25s.; 18s.)
- UTLEY, FRED. *Japan's gamble in China.* London: Secker and Warburg. 1938. Pp. xii, 302. (6s.)
- VOIGT, F. A. *Unto Caesar.* London: Constable and Co. [Toronto: Macmillan Co. of Canada]. 1938. Pp. xiv, 359. (\$3.25)
- WHEELER-BENNETT, JOHN W. *Brest-Litovsk: The forgotten peace, March, 1918.* London: Macmillan and Co. [Toronto: Macmillan Co. of Canada]. 1938. Pp. xx, 478. (\$7.00)
- WILLIAMS, Sir JOHN FISCHER. *Aspects of modern international law: An introduction.* London, New York, Toronto: Oxford University Press. 1939. Pp. viii, 114.
- WILLSON, W. H. *Empire trade: A concise handbook to the markets of the British Empire.* London: P. S. King. 1938. Pp. xiv, 296. (10s., 6d.)
- WISKEMANN, ELIZABETH. *Czechs and Germans.* (Royal Institute of International Affairs.) London, New York: Oxford University Press. 1938. Pp. ix, 299. (\$3.00)
- YOUNG, CHARLES H. and REID, HELEN R. Y. *The Japanese Canadians.* With a second part on "Oriental standards of living" by W. A. CARROTHERS. Edited by H. A. INNIS. (Published under the auspices of the Canadian National Committee for Mental Hygiene; The Canadian Institute of International Affairs.) Toronto: The University of Toronto Press. 1938. Pp. xxx, 295. (\$2.25)
- ZIFF, WILLIAM B. *The rape of Palestine.* New York, Toronto: Longmans, Green. 1938. Pp. xvi, 612. (\$4.00)

REVIEWS OF BOOKS

THE CONFIDENTIAL CORRESPONDENCE OF LORD ELGIN ON THE GOVERNMENT OF CANADA

The Elgin-Grey Papers, 1846-1852. Edited with notes and appendices by Sir ARTHUR G. DOUGHTY. In four volumes. Vols. I, II, III, and IV. Ottawa : King's Printer. 1937. Pp. xx, 448; 449-899; 900-1295; 1296-1663.

WITH the publication of the *Elgin-Grey papers* the most vital of the private documents which concern the development of Canadian self-government have been placed at the disposal of scholars. A fortunate piece of misjudgment has at the same time presented us with a mass of Canadian and American newspaper cuttings, enclosed in Lord Elgin's letters; from these it is possible to learn what contemporary opinion was between 1847 and 1852, and how it expressed itself. From the point of view of good book-making it was perhaps wrong to overweight the actual private letters with so much extraneous matter; the primary purpose of publication was to reveal what Lord Elgin as governor-general of Canada had to say to, and what he received from, his kinsman, the colonial secretary, Earl Grey. It is indeed impossible to justify the enlargement of the project by the reproduction, in the two later volumes, of material on the navigation laws, immigration, and other subjects, important but hardly relevant to the purpose of the book, and already in print. But, at least with regard to the contemporary cuttings, students of early Victorian Canada will shut their eyes to a possible error in judgment, which will help them in reconstructing the public life of Canada in one of its great epochs.

Democracies, and especially the younger of them, dislike and resent attempts to picture their beginnings in unflattering and unexaggerated detail; but Great Britain and Canada taught each other so many necessary lessons between 1838 and 1854, and the Elgin-Grey letters illustrate the process of mutual education so exactly, that the present critic intends to indicate from this invaluable collection, the mixture of strength and weakness, triviality and profound good sense, out of which, in the critical years up to 1854, one of the chief triumphs of modern democracy, the British Commonwealth, began to emerge. Self-examination is as essential and healthful to commonwealths as to individual sinners.

In modern analyses of British policy it is usual to begin, sometimes also to end, on a note of unsympathetic disparagement. The Elgin-Grey letters furnish some suitable material. In diplomacy the hard experiences of the Napoleonic wars had produced in Castlereagh, Canning, and Palmerston, something very nearly first rate. In finance and the political side of commerce and industry, Sir Robert Peel, the greatest of nineteenth-century prime ministers, borrowing at times from men like Huskisson and Cobden, had revealed an economic outlook the most practically enlightened in the world. But in colonial things, while the wars had created a new empire for Britain, and a wave of "folk-wandering" was steadily populating that empire with admirable settlers, British statesmen found it difficult to rise above mediocrity. Once old authoritarianism had begun to go, the Tories, from Wellington to Gladstone in his younger days, saw nothing but disaster ahead, persecuted Lord Durham as a revolutionary character, quarrelled with poor Bagot's innocent exhibition of common sense in Canada, praised Metcalfe for the most misguided acts of his virtuous career, and, as Grey wrote to Elgin in May, 1849, "there begins to prevail in the H. of Commons & I am sorry t[o] say in the highest quarters, an opinion . . . that we have no interest in preserving our Colonies & ought therefore to Make no sacrifice for that purpose, Peel, Graham, & Gladstone

if they do not avow this opinion as openly as Cobden & his friends, yet betray very clearly that they entertain it . . ." (pp. 351-2). Misguided as the Tories were, they were less obviously inadequate in colonial affairs than Cobden and the strict economists. Bright, with the eloquence and conscience of a first-rate man and the intelligence of a second rate, and Cobden, with the pacific and judicious temper of a competent shop-keeper, had decided that empire was costly, the adventurer's life overseas absurd, colonial connections troublesome to both sides in the bargain, and that nothing mattered but the laws of supply and demand which had been omitted, apparently by inadvertence, from the ten commandments. Again and again Elgin protested to Grey against "the Cobden class of home politicians." "I know," he said bitterly in November, 1850, "that Mr Cobden is writing to Gentlemen in America begging them to annex us as soon as possible . . ." (p. 734).

Neither Tories nor Free Traders roused Elgin's indignation, however, so much as the complacent, compromising, responsible Whigs with their deadly moderation, their blank ignorance of the facts, and their inability at least to keep silence when they were unfit to advise. "You must renounce the habit of telling the Colonies that the Colonial is a provisional existence," he burst out to Grey in one of the most admirable of his letters (pp. 608-13). He had been reading the peroration of Lord John Russell's speech, February 8, 1850, and resented the air of smug enlightenment with which the prime minister speculated on the peaceful dissolution of the empire. "Let us give them," Russell had said, "as far as we can, the capacity of ruling their own affairs—let them increase in wealth and population, and whatever may happen, we have the consolation of saying that we have contributed to the happiness of the world" (p. 608).

Grey himself was, on the whole, free from the prevailing epidemic of faint-heartedness, but he had his own contribution of error to make. In his letters one can sometimes detect a tone of benevolent patronage towards the people under his care, as though he felt, while regretting it, that they were, and were likely to remain, an inferior sort of Anglo-Saxon. Today, he seems to offend most gravely in his very doctrinaire counsels of Cobdenite free trade to a governor and a colony, both of them faced with the ugliest problems which international trade conflicts could raise—declining markets and unrelenting American protectionism. One can almost see the gown, the cap, the halo, suitably academic, of self-conscious rectitude, adorning the colonial secretary as he lectured Elgin, and with him all Canada, on the eternal truth of the Manchester gospel; "Now the very essence of this policy is that we shd regulate our own duties on imports without reference to the duties wh. foreign states may levy on our produce, under the conviction that . . . foreign Countries hurt themselves far more than they do us by imposing restrictions on the import of our goods" (p. 806). How perfectly correct, but how hopelessly infuriating to Canadians—millers and others—who had seen the hopes, created by British legislation in 1843, dispelled because Great Britain had discovered that resolute free trade best suited her own selfish interests in 1846.

If one turns to the colony, on the surface there seems little cause for encouragement. In all good democracies representative figures appear, undramatically and in sober guise, who elicit from the people their higher qualities, and anticipate the wisdom which has hardly yet had time to show itself. But at first sight the Elgin-Grey letters reveal the bad patches in the colony, and these especially at the extremes. The period 1846-52 was that in which old Toryism in Canada confessed itself bankrupt. Bishop Strachan in those years was not only fighting a rear-guard action over the clergy reserves, but was attempting with characteristic tenacity to challenge the new provincial university with his own project of an Anglican establishment. He had gone behind Elgin's back, misin-

formed Earl Grey, and misled Sir Robert Peel. Happily in Elgin he met a man capable, even when insulted, of seeing the humour in things. "The Bp.," he wrote, "has all his life been in the habit of writing for England and addressing himself to an audience profoundly ignorant of all the facts with which he was dealing. This has given him a very dashing style as a controversialist" (p. 833). Even that good gentleman John Beverley Robinson appeared hardly at his best in the uncongenial company of a Peelite governor and a Whig colonial secretary; when they offered him a C.B. in recognition of past and present merits, his reply forced from Elgin the dry comment that it "was not remarkable for good taste or modesty." The clearest confession of futility in the old party was, however, discerned first by Elgin in the ministry which held office on his arrival. Draper and his colleagues had been used by the late governor-general for what he thought the defence of the empire, and they had used Metcalfe in return to recover the party's ancient hold on political loaves and fishes. They had no constructive policy, no hold on the country, and the barest of majorities in the assembly. Their head, Draper, was the first to effect his escape from the failing cause to the safety of the bench; and, in 1848, in an atmosphere of Tory chaos the true representatives of the people, Baldwin and Lafontaine, came into office.

As futile and unprofitable for their country the left-wing extremists appeared, between 1847 and 1852, to diversify the scene. Foremost among them was the former rebel Papineau. Elgin, with the shrewd audacity which was one of his most useful characteristics, invited Papineau to dinner, and found him a very well-bred intelligent man,¹ but he still remained an ineffectual nuisance. Perhaps the most interesting of the newspaper cuttings here printed are those which remind us that once there was, as Papineau's organ, a Canadian *L'Avenir*, preaching very Parisian revolutionism in America, but that the keen trans-Atlantic air checked its growth, and brought it to a premature end. It was always too emotional for its audience: "Appuyé sur sa conscience et la nation, il peut mépriser la haine d'hommes et de journaux qu'il a démasqués. Leurs injures ne survivront pas, le nom d'un bon citoyen est toujours recueilli par l'histoire" (p. 294). May he rest in a peace which life failed to bring to him. Mackenzie, too, enters these pages, sick for home, and finding exile from Canada and the flag a poor recompense for his consciousness of having played the man in 1837. "I was sincere and straight forward, even in error," he confessed to Colonel Bruce, through whom he approached Elgin in 1848. "*Never either when in England or in Canada . . . did I ask for the smallest personal favor, place or office.* Never in the Legislature, crude as my ideas often were, did I allow any measure to slip, that I believed would promote good Government. I worked like a Slave; in my place late and early. . . . When in London I told Lord Goderich that we would have to revolt if some concession or change was not made. His reply has appeared in both continents. There was much of error in my movements but there was no deceit" (pp. 232-3). Mackenzie had fired his shot in 1837; thereafter there was little for him but to decline, quickly if he could, into obscurity. Elgin, who had a gift of humorous assessment of character, hit the mark pretty accurately when he reported that Mackenzie had been returned as a member of assembly: "He will I have little doubt be about equally troublesome to every party and I think, though Heaven forbid I should speak confidently of any one, is sounder on annexation than many who profess his betters" (p. 821).

Of other left-wing leaders, George Brown may be allowed to bring up the rear with his new Clear Grits. Of him it must be said that Canada, and especially its

¹Extracts from the letters of James, Earl of Elgin, to Mary Louisa, Countess of Elgin, 1847-1862 (privately printed, 1864), p. 3.

press, owe too much to him to press criticism very far. For Elgin, after 1850, he was the leader of a new kind of revolt, and one who threatened the recently established quiet with unfortunate declarations on race and religion. Elgin had always an eye for quality, even when the *Globe* betrayed some kinship with *Eatanswill Gazette*: "He is out of humor however about something," Elgin wrote of Brown in November, 1851, "and he has flown off on the most ultra anti Prelatic, anti-Catholic, anti State Church ticket—He is a man of ability, and his address where he puts forward his sentiments calmly is interesting" (p. 969).

Here was an imperial democracy, if the phrase may be allowed, hampered by the timidity, ignorance, and sometimes frank incapacity of the men in London offices; used and misled by a self-constituted "loyalist" group, which cared at least as much for place and profit as for imperial unity; embarrassed on occasion by cranks who had either failed, or were bent on pushing their private notions with little regard for public weal. Four personal factors saved the situation, set the colony on its way to becoming a nation, and in asserting the interests of the empire prepared the way for a new commonwealth. All four are seen to best advantage in the years under consideration.

Louis Lafontaine was in many ways the most notable of modern French Canadians. Loving his people without limit or hesitation, he was firm in his belief that the future for them lay along the line of political moderation, allegiance to law, and quiet fidelity to the French tradition, whether in culture, politics, or religion. Through one of Elgin's press-cuttings we have access once more to the speech in which, after twenty-one years of public life and at the age of forty-three, Lafontaine said farewell to politics. Amid the confusions of the time there was something of tranquil confidence in his resolute statement of French rights, his profound belief in constitutional liberty, even in his charming compliment to a governor-general who had sympathized with his point of view "and whose understanding of the English Constitution is not surpassed" (pp. 901-5). It was a natural single step from Lafontaine to Wilfrid Laurier.

In the second place there was Lafontaine's faithful partner, Robert Baldwin, who still shines in these pages with a subdued and gentle steadiness. It was Elgin, more than any other, who saw to it that Baldwin should have his proper place in Canadian political life and history, as "the most conservative statesman in Canada," and one "worth three regiments to the British connection." It is, perhaps, a very old and often-told story, but it is good for Canadians to be reminded of so much public virtue and honour as this plain and simple man possessed. Whatever the modern reader's views, honest men cannot but feel moved in reading Baldwin's ultimatum to annexationists within his party: "The Mother Country has now for years been leaving to us powers of Self government more ample than even we had asked. And it does appear a most ungracious return to select such a time for asking for a separation from her for ever. I can at all events not only be no party to any such proceeding, but must not suffer it to be supposed that I have a moment's doubt respecting it" (pp. 520-1). It is easier to understand the growth of the Canadian reaction after having made acquaintance with such men as Baldwin and Lafontaine.

The third factor in the making of Canada and the confirming of the commonwealth was simply the united Canadian people. It is as impossible to compliment, as it is to bring an indictment against, a whole people; but no one will peruse these volumes, written by the British statesmen who in that period knew Canadians best, without feeling that Elgin's strength was rendered useful, perhaps even possible, because he governed men fit for the kind of institutions which he devoted his best energies to securing for them.

It is hardly necessary to say that the decisive personal factor was Elgin himself. Certainly these letters, read by discerning minds, must prove how decisively he was the greatest of the governors-general, and perhaps, between 1847 and 1854, the wisest man in North America. Many of the letters now printed have been used or reproduced elsewhere. The man's qualities have been assessed and reassessed until perhaps Canadians will begin to resent that, once more, he should be called just; but there is half a page in the correspondence which might be recommended to politicians in days when violence and retribution seem the order of the day. Earl Grey had written the Canadian chapter of his *Colonial policy*, and had sent it for Elgin's comments. He had recalled the troubles of 1849, and more especially the attack on Elgin himself when he went to give his assent to the Rebellion Losses Bill. "I am strongly of opinion," wrote Elgin (and Grey accepted his judgment), "that nothing but evil can result from the publication at this period of a detailed and circumstantial statement of the disgraceful proceedings which took place here after the Bill passed. Most persons who were engaged in these transactions regret the part they took in them—But it is needless to say that the surest way to arrest a process of conversion is to dwell on errors of the past, and to place in a broad light the contrast between present sentiments and those of an earlier date. . . . As to imputations affecting my own honor and character,—these of course are in my own keeping" (pp. 1049-50).

His sanity, justice, and moderation disguised his greatness, for most men are fools in their taste for the brutal, the spectacular, and the egotistic. Elgin is the best refutation which democracy can offer to the fallacies of the dictators. It was his business not to avenge wrongs, but to prevent their creation; he knew that what men call ideals are often prejudices erected into principles for which idealists proceed to shed each other's blood; and never once did he precipitate a crisis when he saw some means of evading it satisfactorily. The bravest thing he ever did was to incur a charge of faintheartedness by refusing to re-enter Montreal in 1849 when he knew that his re-entry must create violent disorder. He had Wellington's example to reinforce his decision, and he quoted to Grey Wellington's words in 1830 when he decided not to enter London: "I would have gone if the law had been equal to protect me but that was not the case. Fifty Dragoons would have done it: but that was a military force. If firing had begun, who could tell when it was to end? one guilty person would fall, and ten innocent be destroyed. Would this have been wise or humane for a little bravado or that the country might not be alarmed for a day or two?" (p. 1050).

The Elgin-Grey letters establish these facts beyond possible challenge: that Elgin was the first British statesman to know how true cabinet government could be established in a colony; the first to see how conservative and unrevolutionary a policy it was; and the first to admit that, once justice is conceded, moderate reformers and national feeling become automatically the friends and guardians of constitutionalism. It was he who taught Britain that the French Canadians, fairly treated, were essentially conservative in their outlook; that, given a recognition of their developing interests, the colonies were reasonable; and that the British Empire, administered with insight, had elements of permanence as one of the great forces in world politics. He gave himself without reserve to shape a new and better Canada, better because dependent, not on British benevolence, but on its own will and resources. The words have been quoted before, but they seem, even though they do not come from these letters to Grey, a fitting close to an estimate of Elgin's work in Canada: "I cannot without a pang bring myself to believe that henceforth all the interests of this great and thriving country are to be to me as a matter in which I have no concern. . . . It is impossible for me to go

through the country without feeling that I have a strong hold on the people of the country; that I occupy a place here which no one ever filled before."²

J. L. MORISON

King's College, University of Durham,
Newcastle-Upon-Tyne, England.

The North American Assault on the Canadian Forest: A History of the Lumber Trade between Canada and the United States. By A. R. M. LOWER. With studies of the *Forest Industries of British Columbia* by W. A. CARROTHERS and of the *Forest Industries in the Maritime Provinces* by S. A. SAUNDERS. (The Relations of Canada and the United States, a series of studies prepared under the direction of the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, Division of Economics and History; J. T. SHOTWELL, director.) Toronto: The Ryerson Press. New Haven: Yale University Press. 1938. Pp. xxviii, 377. (\$3.50)

THIS volume is one in the rapidly expanding series on the relations of Canada and the United States sponsored by the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace. Since Mr. Lower is primarily interested in eastern Canada, his work is rounded out by special studies on British Columbia and the Maritime Provinces. The position of this volume in the series is described in Dr. Shotwell's preface as "strategic" in view of the fact that lumber followed fur as a staple product in the period preceding the rise of modern industrialism. The lumber industry, moreover, was tied in with imperial trade as it furnished return cargoes for vessels carrying goods or immigrants from the British Isles.

In a series of short chapters, Mr. Lower proceeds, in a workmanlike manner, to sketch in the background of his picture. Geography, he makes clear immediately, is responsible for the fact that the histories of lumbering in the two countries cannot be separated; they are parts of a single story. The relation of the drainage and transportation systems to supply and demand is outlined and a description is then given of the forests themselves and of the comparative value of the leading commercial timber trees. Mr. Lower then passes on to the technique of lumbering, "from felling the tree to nailing up the boards on the wall of a house." Seeking a "timber berth," building the camp, felling the trees, hauling, yarding, breaking the rollway, driving, towing, and booming, all find a place in his description as do also the improvement of streams and the development of sawmills.

Turning from the technique of lumbering the book outlines the growth of the industry first in the Maritime Provinces which had important relations with the West Indian and American markets, and then in the St. Lawrence valley. The importance of political events which affected the industry is made clear, as for example the Reciprocity Treaty of 1854. From this point the history of the assault on the Canadian forest is followed chronologically, the competition for Canadian raw material from the abrogation of the Reciprocity Treaty to the turn of this century, merging into the development of the pulp industry in recent years. The book comes to a close with a brief mention of the Canadian-American Trade Agreement of 1936.

To those interested in the history of lumbering on the North American continent, Mr. Lower makes clear the important similarities and differences of lumbering in the two countries. An important difference is in respect of forest tenure. In the United States "stumpage" rights or timberlands were acquired

²Extracts from the letters of James, Earl of Elgin, p. 9.

from private landowners or secured under the liberal homestead privilege, whereas in Canada the government intervened relatively early, and compelled lumbermen to take out leases or licences. According to figures in Mr. Saunders's section, the crown still controls 13 per cent of forested lands in Nova Scotia; 45 per cent in New Brunswick; 92 per cent in Quebec; 97 per cent in Ontario; and 93 per cent in British Columbia. Only in Prince Edward Island have forest holdings passed entirely into private hands. Similarities are found in such matters as: the mechanized technique in the Pacific north-west on both sides of the forty-ninth parallel; the effect of the Panama canal on the Pacific coast shipments; the impatience of the lumberman with "conservation"; the concern with tariffs; the rivalry of Maine and the Maritime Provinces for the West India trade; the shift from pine to spruce. The author ranges a wide field: canals and cant-dogs; railways and reciprocity; ton timber and tariffs; "Pay Ay" labour and pulp wood; lumbermen's songs, and land speculations; drives and drawbacks; and many others. He also finds time to discuss Canadian and American capitalism in the lumber industry; the conflict between the settler and the lumberman; and the place of canals and railways in the lumber domain.

Not the least virtue of Mr. Lower's work are the suggestions, in such quotations as the following, of opportunities for further inquiry: "In fact it has been maintained that the quarrel between the operators on the Connecticut River and the interests represented by Sir John Wentworth, Governor of New Hampshire and Surveyor-General of Woods and Forests, operating from Portsmouth, was the reason why the Connecticut interests espoused the cause of the Revolution . . ." (p. 55); ". . . the history of much of North America might be termed the history of the rivalry of New York and Montreal" (p. 58); "[parliamentary committees] unearthed the fact that much of the timber enjoying the enormous colonial preference in the British market was not colonial at all but American" (p. 94); "So numerous were the American firms engaged in cutting down Canadian forests that the period has been referred to as 'the height of the American raid from New York across Canada to Michigan'" (p. 138).

The bibliography is proof of the author's scholarly interest. Not only has Mr. Lower examined a host of printed sources, newspapers, and official publications, but he has explored manuscript material of both an archival and a private nature. Here, this reviewer ventures to suggest a neglected source, at least on the American side of the line, namely, the records of the smaller political units such as the towns and counties.

The studies of Mr. Carrothers on British Columbia and of Mr. Saunders on the Maritime Provinces follow the same general method of sketching a geographical background and discussing forest tenure. Both essays are compiled chiefly from official publications. The injection of statistics which could be better placed in an appendix does not find favour with this reviewer. A chapter by Mr. Carrothers on the mechanization of the lumber industry in the largely snowless Pacific north-west provides an important contrast with Mr. Lower's description of eastern winter logging.

The book is illustrated by several maps and charts. The maps used as end-pieces are attractive. One wishes that the publishers had included pictorial illustrations, since the lumber industry offers so rich an opportunity in this respect. A brief index is included, but it is barely adequate.

RICHARD G. WOOD

Manchester, New Hampshire.

The Life and Adventures of John Nicol, Mariner: His Service in King's Ships in War & Peace, His Travels & Explorations by Sea to Remote & Unknown Countries in Merchant Vessels . . . as related by himself . . . & embellished with numerous original designs by Gordon Grant. Foreword and afterword by ALEXANDER LAING. New York, Toronto: Farrar and Rinehart. 1936. Pp. viii, 214.

IN 1822 a broken-down seaman, sixty-seven years of age, picking up bits of coal in the streets of Edinburgh, caught the eye of one "J.H.," said to have been John Howell, a struggling author. The old man had an interesting tale to tell of strange adventures happened by land and sea. The result was a duodecimo volume of 215 pages: *The life and adventures of John Nicol, mariner*, published in the same year by William Blackwood, Edinburgh, and T. Cadell, London. The volume has been known to collectors of Americana for many years, and while not in the "scarce" category is rarely offered by the dealers. In 1925 it was republished in a condensed form by the Marine Research Society of Salem, Mass., in a compilation entitled, *The sea, the ship, and the sailor*.

About 1936, Alexander Laing, seeking first-hand accounts of the life of common seamen in the early 1800's, came across a copy of the original edition. Caught by its freshness and freedom of expression, he resolved to re-issue the work in a style worthy of its importance, in his view, as "prose surpassed in its kind by none but that of Melville." Accordingly it now appears as a quarto volume of 214 pages, wide-margined, "embellished with numerous original designs" by Gordon Grant, and beautifully printed and bound. But in the opinion of this reviewer neither the human interest nor the style of the writing—not to mention the historical value—justifies this *de luxe* presentation. The editor, with burning enthusiasm and superlative laudation, has added a foreword of twenty-five pages and an afterword of twenty-three more.

The body of the book reproduces the text of the original work, but neither there nor in the voluminous preface and postscript is there a single note elucidating its statements or touching its historical accuracy. The pagination of the 1822 edition has not been retained by marginal numbers. In his voyagings John Nicol sailed in 1785 as cooper on the ship *King George*, Captain Portlock, in company with the *Queen Charlotte*, Captain Dixon, on one of the earliest trading ventures to the North-West Coast of America. Therein lies the interest of the book to the student of Canadian history. The account of this voyage covers pages 81-111 of the reprint. As it ended in August, 1788, and Nicol kept no diary, his remembrance of its events twenty-four years later shows inaccuracies when checked against the official narratives of Portlock and Dixon, published in the following year. The vessels traded on the coast in 1786 and again in 1787; but Nicol runs the incidents of the two years into one continuous story omitting any mention of the visit to the Hawaiian Islands which intervened. At the same time he, for instance on pages 89 and 90 (being pp. 81-3 of the original edition), tells of occurrences and adventures with the Indians that find no place in Portlock's stately volume. The book is, nevertheless, valuable as a supplement and companion-piece from the forecastle to the official versions of the captains. Moreover, this beautiful example of the printer's and binder's art will provide the student of the history of the Pacific coast at a very moderate figure with a copy of a really useful book now difficult to obtain in the original edition.

F. W. HOWAY

New Westminster, B.C.

Postscript to Adventure: The Autobiography of Ralph Connor. By CHARLES W. GORDON. New York: Farrar and Rinehart [Toronto: Oxford University Press]. 1938. Pp. xviii, 430. (\$3.00)

THIS is not the autobiography of Ralph Connor. One chapter tells, perfunctorily, the story of the composition and publication of his first novel, *Black rock*, and adds a few not very illuminating notes on *The sky pilot* and *The man from Glengarry*. About the rest of Ralph Connor's books scarcely anything is said; and Dr. Gordon had intended to suppress the chapter dealing with the first three. It is clear that what he intended to tell was not the story of Ralph Connor but the story of Charles W. Gordon, pastor, pioneer, statesman, and soldier.

That story he has admirably told. A certain roughness of texture in some of the later chapters shows that the book we have is not quite the book Dr. Gordon meant to give us; but what we have is in its substance what he planned to write. It is a clear, vivid, and reflective account of a representative Canadian life. The life was not unlike that of other soberly practical idealists, who have known how to keep their impulses in harness; but the account is unlike what the others have written. On the forbidding shelf of Canadian autobiographies, written by men (and women) to whom the pen was a much less manageable implement than the sword, or the paddle, or the dictaphone, this book will stand out as the work of a craftsman to whom the manipulation of words was an art demanding and rewarding the greatest pains.

The story is not only interesting, as Ralph Connor's novels usually were; unlike them, it is important. From it one can form a clear and no doubt accurate impression of Glengarry in the seventies; Zorra in the eighties; Calgary and its environs a little later; Winnipeg, especially the parish of St. Stephen's, in the twenty years preceding the war; the frontline trenches, where Dr. Gordon served with a regiment recruited largely from men of his own parish. As the book reaches the period from 1916, when the state of Dr. Gordon's health obliged him to withdraw from active service at the front, to 1937, when he died, it becomes less effective. Like so many Canadians of his generation he dreamed of a part on the international scene; and he appears to have thought that an interview with an American president or a session of the League of Nations was more significant to report than the tenor of life in Winnipeg. In the last hundred pages there are none of the vivifying phrases, none of the concrete passages, none of the illuminating insights which make the earlier part of the book important as well as interesting.

In this journal attention should be drawn to the practically verbatim accounts of an interview with Asquith in 1913 (in which the main theme was the attitude of Canada in a hypothetical British war) and a stormy interview with Woodrow Wilson not long before the United States abandoned neutrality. More important still, perhaps, is the record of Dr. Gordon's role in the formation of the Union government in Canada. With a quiet but exceedingly bitter art he has described Mr. Bennett's indifference to the news that Sir Wilfrid Laurier was willing to take the second place in such a government. The description of his encounter with Mr. Bennett is one of a hundred which establish that if this is not Ralph Connor's autobiography, it was Ralph Connor who wrote it.

E. K. BROWN

The University of Toronto.

Sir Thomas Roddick: His Work in Medicine and Public Life. By HUGH ERNEST MACDERMOT. Toronto: The Macmillan Company of Canada. 1938. Pp. xiv, 160. (\$1.50)

ALTHOUGH not qualified according to Dr. Johnson's test—"nobody can write the life of a man, but those who have eat and drunk and lived in social intercourse with him"—the author of this volume has produced an interesting biography of Sir Thomas Roddick, one time dean of the faculty of medicine, McGill University. At first glance one would expect this biography to appeal primarily to members of the medical profession. It has, however, an appeal to the general as well as to the technical reader, for no figure in Canadian medical history has been fuller of vitality than Sir Thomas Roddick, and none more deeply inspired by the best ideals of his profession. For over half a century he was intimately associated with McGill University as a student, teacher, and administrator.

Sir Thomas Roddick's name is generally associated with three achievements: the introduction of Lord Lister's antiseptic methods into Montreal hospitals and the dominion generally; the organization of the medical service in the field during the North-West Rebellion; and the unification of medical registration throughout Canada. Of these achievements the last two are of particular interest to students of Canadian history.

When the dominion government was required in March, 1885, to send a force to suppress the rebellious métis of the district of Saskatchewan, no army medical corps existed to care for the needs of the troops. The improvisation of such a corps was the work of Dr. D. Bergin of Cornwall, Ontario, assisted by Dr. T. C. Roddick. As chief of the medical staff in the field, Roddick was responsible for the organization of field and base hospitals and for the evacuation of the wounded men. There were no outstanding developments during the rebellion, and probably for this reason the medical side of the story has usually been ignored, except for casual references, by the historians of these events. Dr. MacDermot's little volume is the first attempt to fill this gap in the history of the North-West Rebellion. For his material the author has made use of Dr. Roddick's manuscript diary in addition to the official reports as printed in the *Sessional papers* for 1886.

The unification of medical registration in Canada raises an issue of topical interest, namely the relations between the federal and the provincial governments. Each of the provinces entered confederation with its own system of registration and with varying standards of medical requirements. Ever jealous of provincial rights they strongly resisted every effort to introduce any system of uniformity. For twelve years Roddick struggled to achieve a reform for which the profession had agitated many years without success. Entering politics in 1896 he finally succeeded in pushing the Canada Medical Act through parliament in 1906. It cost Roddick another five years' incessant labour, however, before the opposition of Quebec, Ontario, and British Columbia was overcome. Finally agreement was achieved and the Dominion Medical Council was organized at Ottawa in 1912.

This book does not pretend to be a complete and exhaustive study either of Sir Thomas Roddick or his times; but it does provide a sympathetic and readable account of the career and personality of a man who was a leading figure of his profession and his generation.

GEORGE F. G. STANLEY

Mount Allison University.

- Le Type économique et social des canadiens. Tome I: Milieux agricoles de tradition française.* By LEON GERIN. (Science sociale.) Montréal: Editions de L'Action Canadienne-Française. 1937. Pp. 221. (\$1.00)
- Notre Américanisation: Enquête de la Revue dominicaine (1936).* Montréal: L'Oeuvre de la Presse Dominicaine. 1937. Pp. 269. (75c.)

THESE two books deal with some aspects of French-Canadian life. That by M. Gérin is the first of a series of three or four which are to be published under the general title. M. Gérin, the son of Antoine Gérin-Lajoie, the author of the well-known *Jean Rivard*, has retired after a distinguished career in the civil service, and is now re-editing some of the material which he has published in France and Canada during the past fifty years. This small volume contains the results of personal inquiries made in five different parts of rural Quebec. The sections of the province are chosen to indicate that the rural population of the province is not entirely of one pattern, and the reader is left with the distinct impression that the *habitant* has remained a true descendant of his French peasant ancestors and has preserved that sense of individualism and that particularity of trait which distinguishes French peasants of one province from those of another. The French-Canadian characteristics here described are the product of a practical attitude and an adaptability to circumstances and environment.

The first type delineated is that of the lower St. Lawrence portion of the province. M. Gérin uses as a basis a monograph published in 1863 in volume V of *Ouvriers des deux mondes*, under the auspices of Frédéric Le Play, on "Le paysan de St-Irénée," a village in the county of Charlevoix, located just a few miles from Murray bay. The hardy, self-sustaining, and vigorous pioneer family of Isidore Gauthier soon overran the local available farm land and moved into the Saguenay and Lake St. John sections. M. Gérin then depicts what is probably the most common type: the sedentary farmer of the central region, Louis Casaubon of St. Justin, near Three Rivers, being used as an example. There is an interesting graph on page 83 which shows the elements in a typical French-Canadian rural family unit and illustrates the relations of that unit with both the immediate and general community. The other localities which are treated are: St. Dominique, in the Yamaska valley about thirty-five miles from Montreal, the seat of the trading farmer who bargains with the city; L'Ange-Gardien, further south, which was pioneered by French-Canadians returned from the New England states; and St. Edwidge de Clifton, in the Eastern Townships near the American border, which was developed by the progressive and emancipated type of soil cultivator.

The book contains a good deal of particularized and over-detailed material which cannot be of much value except to a student of local history, but through it are pages of sound and acute observation on factors which have made some of rural Quebec's characteristic traits. The author is unquestionably a conscientious craftsman of an older school.

La Revue dominicaine is a periodical published by the Dominican Fathers under the competent editorship of the Rev. Father M. A. Lamarche. It is noteworthy for its strikingly effective typographical appearance and for what may be termed its up-to-date editorial policy. *Notre Américanisation* is a series of articles on the influence of the United States on French-Canadian life which appeared in the *Revue* during the course of the year 1936. The many aspects of the question were developed by members of the order and by prominent laymen. Religion, philosophy, the cinema, sports, radio, the press, magazines, and financial and commercial practices are successively surveyed as fields in which the influence of American habits and modes is exercised daily upon Canadians. These are the

channels through which the tempestuous pulsations from the south reach French Canada.

On the whole, the reader will not necessarily find a categorical condemnation of this American influence, but a recommendation that care and choice be practised. Father Lamarche concludes the book with a valuable summary of the preceding chapters. The reader cannot but draw from this book the conclusion that French Canadians remain the lasting bulwark against the moral and spiritual annexation of Canada by the United States.

Montreal.

LEON LALANDE

The French Canadians To-day: A People on the March. By WILFRID BOVEY. Toronto: J. M. Dent and Sons (Canada). 1938. Pp. xii, 362. (\$3.00)

THE theme of this book is most clearly stated in the sub-title, *A people on the march*. Perhaps the title of M. Gérard Filteau's work, *La naissance d'une nation*, which won the Quebec provincial prize in 1937, would have been more exact, for Colonel Bovey has traced surely and sympathetically and in a convincing manner the birth of a nation.

The author, it is true, does not come to any such clear-cut conclusion. Indeed he takes pains to point out the economic interests which bind French Canadians to the rest of Canada, and the concern of ecclesiastical and political leaders in Quebec to stress the value of British institutions and ties, and of confederation. But with great clarity he sketches the history of a people whose basic ideal has become more conscious with every passing decade. That ideal is expressed in their motto—"Je me souviens." What does the French Canadian remember? He remembers the desertion of France, the conquest by England, the long unceasing fight to maintain his identity on an overwhelmingly alien continent. In that struggle, as Colonel Bovey so aptly shows, he has created a literature of his own, an architecture with its associated arts, and has exhibited a determination to cleave to his language, his customs, his church, those things and ideas which differentiate him from other people,—a determination which may be equalled but is unsurpassed by any people in the world.

Ideas and actions of this sort are the warp and woof of nationalism wherever it is found. All those who are conversant with the rise of Germany and Italy, with the appearance of the Slavic nations, and with the development of Turkish and Arab nationalism know how great a role has been played by the cultivation of language and literature, of art, of history, of a national philosophy. In all these cases such movements have led or are leading to the emergence of independent states. One wonders, therefore, after reading such a book whether the "Jeunesses Patriotes" who cry for the establishment of "Laurentia" are so much on the sidelines as Colonel Bovey would like to believe. Nationalism is a vast mass passion. As it grows, and moves the hearts of millions, matters of dollars and cents, economic ties, become of less consideration. They can even be forgotten. If the moderates and compromisers are in the saddle today, it may be that only the half-way stage has been reached.

However that may be, this book is to be recommended to the close attention of all Canadians and Americans. The time is long past when they can afford to stick their heads in the sand and say this issue does not exist, or that it will disappear if they ignore it. They would not have received so many nasty shocks in the past if the policy of ignoring French Canada had not been so rigidly followed.

The book has its weaknesses, notably the lack of an index which lowers its value in an annoying manner as a work of reference. The author's style is rather discursive in the later chapters. But *The French Canadians to-day* is an eye-opener that should be read and re-read.

R. M. SAUNDERS

The University of Toronto.

Canada, Senate of. *Report pursuant to Resolution of the Senate to the Honourable the Speaker by the Parliamentary Counsel relating to: The Enactment of the British North America Act, 1867, Any Lack of Consonance between its Terms and Judicial Construction of Them and Cognate Matters. Session of 1939.* Ottawa: King's Printer. 1939. Pp. 18; Annex 1: 160; Annex 2: 132; Annex 3: 222; Annex 4: 154; Annex 5: 28.

DURING the session of 1938 the senate passed a resolution requesting its parliamentary counsel—Mr. W. F. O'Connor—to report (i) on pre-federation records so as to disclose "the scope of the intended legislative powers of that precise central or general union which was presented to and accepted by the three original provinces"; (ii) to compare the text of the B.N.A. Act dealing with the distribution of legislative powers with such records and with the judgments of the judicial committee; and (iii) to present any material differences between the scheme intended and its statement in the act together with a similar view of the judgments of the judicial committee, to disclose in what respects, if at all, it would be necessary to amend the act so as to produce consonance with the original intentions or to make it a sufficient instrument for the present government of Canada, and to review any other matters relevant to the reference.

At once let it be said that Mr. O'Connor has carried out his work in an exemplary manner and that he has drawn up a report which is not only admirable in relation to his reference, but of the greatest importance to all citizens. He has brought to his review careful legal scholarship, diligent and accurate research, and a keen appreciation of the problems involved. He has dignified the civil service; and we sincerely trust that the governments of Canada will in future encourage its permanent officials, who may be competent, to do work of this nature. In this connection, we trust that they will avoid the penny-wise policy of parsimony in technique. Mr. O'Connor's first-class work is severely handicapped by having no index, no table of cases, and no possible facilities for reference. And yet it is such as emphatically to demand them. Such petty saving is ludicrous. Finally, at this point we would congratulate Mr. O'Connor on the general clarity of his presentation. At times, he writes in the style of affected and entirely unnecessary ponderosity often so dear to the profession, and at times it is necessary to reread his sentences. Once, however, the hedge is broken through, we enter a rich pasture.

It would be impossible within anything like reasonable space to examine the report in detail. We may, however, point out its outstanding values. First, for the readers of the *CANADIAN HISTORICAL REVIEW*, we would call attention to the material in the annexes 2, 4, and 5, which includes invaluable extracts from the pre-federation debates and journals of Nova Scotia, New Brunswick, and Canada; apposite references and details from 1759 to the London conference of 1866-7, with an invaluable examination of the B.N.A. Act in relation to antecedent resolutions; a critical historical investigation into the term "property and civil rights" and into the "compact theory"; and finally certain documents of the modern period. Here the historian will find in convenient form material and references carefully and accurately given.

For the profession, the report itself is to say the least challenging. Its qualities in manner are excellent. Each case is examined, in relation to the reference, in chronological order, and is then adequately quoted in an annex. The intent of the London resolutions is shown to be expressed clearly and unequivocally in the terms of the act, and the terms of the act are related to the cases in a method never previously attempted. There emerges a view of the problems which discloses that intent and statutory statement correspond, that for twenty years or so the courts respected the act, and that afterwards they warped and twisted the act to the destruction not merely of the intent but of its plain, manifest, and clear terms. It would be impossible to examine the details through which Mr. O'Connor arrives at this position. It is, however, not too much to say that his work seems to point to the inevitable conclusion that the act would be adequate were its terms applied, and that we ought not to worry over changing it until we get behind the inexplicable judicial obscurities to the clarity of its terms. He hopes for an Interpretation Act to accomplish this end. Be that as it may, the report suggests (i) that we have a good practicable distribution of powers, elastic and suitable for progress if only we applied it and (ii) that the whole problem of the appeals to the judicial committee is worthy of more consideration than it has ever received. Certainly it is not one on which the organized profession should have the last word. Mr. O'Connor has carried out his duties in an exemplary manner and he has made an outstanding contribution to the literature of the subject.

W. P. M. KENNEDY

The Law Building,
The University of Toronto.

The United States and Santo Domingo, 1798-1873: A Chapter in Caribbean Diplomacy. By CHARLES CALLAN TANSILL. (The Walter Hines Page School of International Relations; The Johns Hopkins University.) Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins Press. 1938. Pp. x, 487. (\$3.50)

The Hawaiian Kingdom, 1778-1854: Foundation and Transformation. By RALPH S. KUYKENDALL. Honolulu: The University of Hawaii. 1938. Pp. viii, 453. (\$5.00)

SOME Gibbon of the future, who writes authoritatively of the decline and fall of the British Empire, will find matter for reflection in the events chronicled in these two volumes. Did the Empire pass its climax at some time between 1794 and 1870? There are symptoms here of a nation growing tired, abandoning growth, beginning a retreat before more youthful competitors. Why did England surrender her claim to the Hawaiian islands—the potential "Gibraltar of the Pacific"—so strategically situated on a line between two great British possessions? Cook discovered the islands in 1778, and in 1794 Vancouver secured from the "king" a cession to the British crown. For a generation the Hawaiians spoke of themselves as *kanaka no Beritane*—"men of Britain." As late as 1824 the British government was still ready to assert its claim to sovereignty, but in 1842 Lord Aberdeen definitely abandoned that claim, and presently "the shadow of destiny"—an American destiny—fell over the islands. It is all very well to say that the missionary and commercial interests of the United States had become dominant, but a growing empire would not have surrendered its claims before a few missionaries and a blustering nation without a navy.

In 1854, it is true, the joint efforts of the British and French succeeded in

blocking both a treaty for the annexation of Hawaii by the United States and a treaty between the United States and the Dominican Republic which was to prepare the way for (though it did not include) the acquisition by the United States of Samana bay as a naval station. But to the later attempts, under Seward and Grant, to secure Samana bay or to annex the Dominican Republic outright, neither British nor French appear to have offered any opposition. None is recorded, at any rate, by Professor Tansill, who gives the earlier moves of British diplomacy in considerable detail.

This point suggests one defect in Mr. Tansill's book, *The United States and Santo Domingo, 1798-1873*. If he has explored British archival material for the period 1867-70 as carefully as for the earlier years, then some comment on the change in British attitude toward Santo Domingo would be in place. If he has not, the study lacks something of being complete. Mr. Tansill does not alter in any very important respect the story of the relations of Santo Domingo and the United States as previously set forth by Sumner Welles in *Naboth's vineyard* and (for the Grant period) by Allan Nevins in *Hamilton Fish*. His most important contributions, it seems to the reviewer, are his account of Anglo-American co-operation toward Santo Domingo, 1798-1800 (chap. II) and his version of the Alta Vela affair (chap. VIII). The book is written with Mr. Tansill's accustomed meticulous care. It leaves untouched, of course, the interesting phases of United States-Dominican relations subsequent to 1873.

Professor Kuykendall's *The Hawaiian Kingdom, 1778-1854*, is the first volume of what is presumably to be a two-volume history of independent Hawaii. There has long been a need for such a history, and Professor Kuykendall, of the University of Hawaii, is unquestionably the right man for the task. The present volume is based almost entirely upon original sources, gathered from Washington, Boston, London, and Paris as well as from Honolulu. It opens with a chapter on primitive Hawaii, and thereafter traces the impact of white civilization in its effects on the government, economic life, education, and religion of the islands, and the ensuing rivalry of British, French, Russians, and Americans for a dominant position, down to the defeat of the annexation project of 1854. The book impresses one as scrupulously fair to all participants in the events related—to men of all nationalities, races, and religions. It is also readable, though the uninitiated will find Hawaiian proper names too much for him. It is an ordeal to meet in one line of text the four great chiefs Keeaumoku, Kameeiamoku, Kamanawa, and Keaweheulu, with Keawemauihili and Kekuhaupio just before and after; and it is puzzling to find, in such names, K changing to T and L changing to R, as they sometimes do. *Haole* readers would thank Mr. Kuykendall for a note on Hawaiian names, pronunciation, and consonant substitutions.

JULIUS W. PRATT

University of Buffalo.

The Story of Alaska. By CLARENCE L. ANDREWS. Caldwell, Idaho: The Caxton Printers. Toronto: Copp, Clark. 1938. Pp. 303. (\$4.00)

FOR fifty years the public has demanded a concise and coherent history of Alaska, a region whose story is closely connected with that of western Canada. The call has at last been heard and heeded. The author of this volume is well known as a Russian scholar and an authority upon the history of that northern land. He has the added advantage of many years of residence in various parts of that vast territory. With careful attention to detail, which however is never permitted to

become tiresome, he sketches the gradual uncovering of the coastal region as the Russian traders advanced slowly and often bloodily from island to island until they reached the mainland, the work of the discoverers and maritime traders from Europe and New England, the organization and operation of the Russian American Company, and the settlements established and the economic development effected during its régime. The story of Von Rezanof's broad schemes finds place and with it his sad love romance. Some space is given to Baranof's ambitious dreams of empire expansion southward along the coast and westward to that crossroads of the Pacific, the Hawaiian islands. The author presents a thumb-nail sketch, quite in contrast with Washington Irving's caricature, of this great man who for twenty-seven years guided the Russian operations in America and who, with proper support, might have changed the map of its western coast. The Russian period, ending in 1867 with the purchase by the United States, occupies about one-half of the book. It contains many interesting facts regarding the fur trade and numerous informative sidelights upon the conduct and movements of the actors therein, both British and American.

The second part deals with Alaska as a territory of the United States. Here the Bering sea fur-seal difficulty and the Alaska boundary dispute are touched upon, but in the very briefest manner. Evidently the author regarded the details of these troubles as belonging to the realm of general history of the United States or to diplomatic history rather than to that of Alaska itself. Of particular interest to Canadians are the pages devoted to the Klondike gold rush. The story is told in four chapters: following the lure of gold; St. Michael and the Yukon; the trails of ninety-eight; and the building of the White Pass Railway. In this connection it is noted that the author was in the United States customs service in Alaska at the time. Of course a chapter is also given to "Soapy Smith" and his notorious gang of gamblers, robbers, and murderers at Skagway. In this connection Mr. Andrews pays a warm tribute to the old North West Mounted Police. "The desperadoes," he says, "dared not pass to the British soil, for in the autumn of 1897 some fifty-seven stalwart North West Mounted Police went into the interior, equipped for business. It was as the Collector of Customs of Alaska wrote in 1874 concerning the gold fields of the Cassiar, 'They soon tame our gun and pistol gentry that come over their boundary.'" A careful examination of the volume fails to reveal any errors of moment. The authorities for its historical statements cover fifty pages of small type closely printed at the end of the book. It is well printed and profusely illustrated. Its worth has been recognized by the book-of-the-month club, which has placed its imprimatur upon it.

F. W. HOWAY

New Westminster, B.C.

RECENT PUBLICATIONS RELATING TO CANADA

PREPARED BY THE EDITORIAL OFFICE OF THE UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO PRESS

(Notice in this bibliography does not preclude a later and more extended review. The following abbreviations are used: B.R.H.—Bulletin des recherches historiques; C.H.R.—CANADIAN HISTORICAL REVIEW; C.J.E.P.S.—Canadian journal of economics and political science; R.S.C.—Royal Society of Canada; S.R.C.—Société royale du Canada.)

I. THE RELATIONS OF CANADA WITHIN THE EMPIRE

- BAILEY, JOSH. *The old country under fire*. Toronto: Macmillan Co. of Canada. 1939. Pp. xiv, 197. (\$1.50) An English business man is concerned to interpret England to Canadians and Canada to the English.
- CHEVALLIER, JEAN-JACQUES. *Explication de l'Empire britannique* (Année politique française et étrangère, XIII, déc., 1938, 301-35).
- The constitutions of all countries*. Vol. I: *The British Empire*. London: His Majesty's Stationery Office. 1938. Pp. viii, 678. (10s. 6d.) To be reviewed later.
- DUMON, LAURENCE. *La situation juridique des Dominions britanniques depuis 1926*. Bordeaux, France. 1935. Pp. 120. A thesis presented at the University of Bordeaux.
- A finding-list of royal commission reports in the British dominions*. Prepared under the direction of ARTHUR HARRISON COLE. Introductory essay by HUGH McDOWELL CLOKIE. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press. 1939. Pp. 134. To be reviewed later.
- FISHER, EDWIN. *La situation économique dans l'Empire britannique* (Revue économique internationale, Brussels, Paris, mars, 1938, 555-68).
- FRANKEL, S. HERBERT. *The future of the British Commonwealth of Nations: Economic and financial aspects* (South African journal of economics, VI (4), Dec., 1938, 378-401). Impressions of the second British Commonwealth relations conference.
- HODSON, H. V. (ed.). *The British Commonwealth and the future: Proceedings of the second unofficial conference on British Commonwealth relations, Sydney, 3rd-17th September, 1938*. Foreword by the Hon. Sir THOMAS BAVIN. (Issued under the joint auspices of the Royal Institute and of the Canadian, Australian, New Zealand, South African and Indian Institutes of International Affairs.) London, New York, Toronto: Oxford University Press. 1939. Pp. xvi, 336. (\$2.50) To be reviewed later.
- HOERNLÉ, R. F. ALFRED. *The future of the British Commonwealth of Nations: Race problems, strategy, foreign policy, and constitutional relations* (South African journal of economics, VI (4), Dec., 1938, 365-77). Impressions of the second British Commonwealth relations conference.
- KEITH, BERRIEDALE. *Notes on imperial constitutional law* (Journal of comparative legislation and international law, XX (4), Nov., 1938, 251-61; XXI (1), Feb., 1939, 98-108).
- KENNEDY, W. P. M. "The Kingdom of Canada" (Canadian bar review, XVII (1), Jan., 1939, 1-6). The author concludes: "The crown, as far as Canada is concerned, is one and indivisible; George VI was not crowned 'King of Canada' in any legal sense, and when the Crown is at war, Canada is at war, and cannot be legally neutral." See reply to this purely legal analysis by T. S. EWART in *Canadian bar review*, XVII (3), March, 1939, 178-80.
- MAEMECKE, ROBERT. *Die rechtliche Stellung der britischen Dominien beim Abschluss internationaler Verträge: Ein Beitrag zur Untersuchung der Rechtsprobleme der britischen Staatengesellschaft*. Leipzig: Deichert. 1938. Pp. xv, 199.

MULLETT, CHARLES F. *The British Empire*. New York: Henry Holt and Co. 1938. Pp. xii, 768. To be reviewed later.

PIDDINGTON, R. A. *The next British Empire: A population policy for home amenity and empire defence*. London: John Murray. 1938. Pp. xii, 294. (6s.) The author presents a novel solution to the problems of the empire. After Canada's population has been increased to about 40 million as a result of wholesale emigration from the British Isles, she will become the centre of an empire consisting of Australia, New Zealand, South Africa, and a sadly depleted United Kingdom, which will henceforth offer little to tempt European expansionists.

PLÜMER, FRIEDRICH. *Das britische Weltreich: Die geopolitischen Grundlagen seiner geschichtlichen Entwicklung*. Dortmund: Druck und Verlag von W. Grüwell. 1938. Pp. 124. (RM 2.10) The main theme of this rather curious work appears to be that the British Empire was created under Nordic leadership, and has been maintained so long by the stout refusal of this Nordic stock to intermarry with inferior colonial races. But in recent times the superior Nordic stock has been losing ground steadily in Great Britain, being more and more confined to the Scottish highlands, whence has come the bulk of imperial leaders in these latter days. With the decline of the ruling race the forthcoming disintegration of the British Empire is foreshadowed. The author feels that war between Britain and Germany is undesirable and the *fuehrer* has provided against this by the conclusion of the Anglo-German naval agreement. [R.M.S.]

STEWART, ROBERT B. *Treaty-making procedure in the British dominions* (American journal of international law, XXXII (3), July, 1938, 467-87).

VILLATE, R. *Forces et faiblesses de l'Empire britannique: Essai de géographie militaire* (Revue militaire générale, Paris, août, 1938, 170-207).

WIEGNER, ERNST. *Der britische Imperialismus: Eine kritische Betrachtung des Chamberlain-Programms*. Zürich: Raunhardt. 1938. Pp. 258.

II. CANADA'S INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS

BREBNER, J. BARTLET. *Canada's choice in foreign affairs* (Quarterly journal of inter-American relations, I (1), Jan., 1939, 50-7).

CHIPMAN, WARWICK. *For peace and freedom—a proposition in Canadian and commonwealth unity* (Canadian congress journal, XVIII (4), April, 1939, 13-15). A plea for adherence to the policy and practice of the covenant of the League of Nations.

FENWICK, C. G. *Canada and the Monroe doctrine* (American journal of international law, XXXII (4), Oct., 1938, 782-5). An inquiry as to the meaning and scope of the Monroe doctrine, aroused by President Roosevelt's Kingston speech (Aug., 1938) promising "assurance that the people of the United States will not stand idly by if domination of Canadian soil is threatened by any other empire."

Foreign policy after Munich (Round table, no. 113, Dec., 1938, 149-52). A note on the effect of the crisis on Canada's foreign policy.

LAING, LIONEL H. *Does the Monroe doctrine cover Canada?* (American journal of international law, XXXII (4), Oct., 1938, 793-6). Considers the implications of President Roosevelt's Kingston speech of Aug. 18, 1938.

LOWER, A. R. M. *Canada and the new world order* (Canadian forum, XIX (220), May, 1939, 44-6). An article on Canadian defence.

Pitfalls for Canadian freedom (Events, V (28), April, 1939, 263-8). Touches on the problems of Canada's foreign and defence policy and her internal politics.

SHIPPEE, LESTER BURRELL. *Canadian-American relations, 1840-1874*. (Relations of Canada and the United States, a series of studies prepared under the direction of the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, division of economics and his-

tory; J. T. SHOTWELL, director.) New Haven: Yale University Press. Toronto: Ryerson Press. 1939. Pp. xvi, 514. (\$3.25) To be reviewed later.

SIMSARIAN, JAMES. *The diversion of waters affecting the United States and Canada* (American journal of international law, XXXII (3), July, 1938, 488-518). Examines diplomatic correspondence since the end of the nineteenth century regarding diversion of waters in United States and Canada which affected interests in the other country.

III. HISTORY OF CANADA

(1) General History

ANDERSON, JEAN RITCHIE. *First native-born explorer honored* [La Vérendrye] (Family herald and weekly star, Sept. 28, 1938); *Diary of a governor's wife* [Countess of Durham] (*ibid.*, Oct. 12, 1938); *Missionary-statesman* [Dr. James Robertson] (*ibid.*, Dec. 14, 1938); *Christmas days in Canada's story* (*ibid.*, Dec. 21, 1938); *Black robe voyageur* [Father Lacombe] (*ibid.*, Feb. 15, 1939); *Royal visitors of earlier days* (*ibid.*, March 22, 1939).

ANDREWS, CLARENCE L. *The story of Alaska*. Caldwell, Idaho: Caxton Printers. Toronto: Copp, Clark. 1938. Pp. 303. (\$4.00) See p. 227.

HOLT, W. STULL (ed.). *Historical scholarship in the United States, 1876-1901: As revealed in the correspondence of Herbert B. Adams*. (Johns Hopkins University studies in historical and political science, series LVI, no. 4.) Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Press. 1938. Pp. 314. (\$2.50) The correspondence throws light on the development of historical interests during the generation in which historical research and teaching became a profession in the United States.

MORTON, ARTHUR S. *A history of the Canadian west to 1870-71: Being a history of Rupert's Land (the Hudson's Bay Company's territory) and of the North-West territory (including the Pacific slope)*. London, Toronto: Thomas Nelson and Sons. N.d. Pp. xiv, 987. (\$6.00) To be reviewed later.

QUINEL, CH. and DE MONTGON, A. *Contes et légendes du far-west*. (Collection des contes et légendes de tous les pays.) Paris: Fernand Nathan. 1937. Pp. 255. America pushing westward—meeting and vanquishing the Indian, discovering gold in California, settling the new territory—forms the background of these tales and legends. Attractive illustrations.

SAGE, WALTER N. *Towards new horizons in Canadian history* (Pacific historical review, VIII (1), March, 1939, 47-57). "The day has past when the history of the St. Lawrence Valley and the Lower Lakes, with some reference to the Maritimes and occasional mention of the West, could be accepted as Canadian history."

Scarlet and gold: Official publication of Royal North West Mounted Police Veterans' Association. Jubilee ed., 65th anniversary, 1873-1938. Vol. XX. Vancouver: Wrigley Printing Co. Pp. 96. (\$1.00) A volume devoted to the work of the Mounted Police, containing a number of narrative and descriptive accounts of policing the north-west, and an interesting outline of the history of the Force by W. E. G. MACDONALD.

SPOUT, HAROLD and MARGARET. *The rise of American naval power, 1770-1918*. Princeton: Princeton University Press. 1939. Pp. xii, 398. (\$3.75) To be reviewed later.

TASCA, HENRY JOSEPH. *The reciprocal trade policy of the United States: A study in trade philosophy*. A dissertation in economics presented to the faculty of the graduate school of the University of Pennsylvania in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of doctor of philosophy. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press. 1938. Pp. xiv, 371. (\$3.50) A detailed examination of the Hull policy of reciprocal agreements to encourage trade.

(2) **Discovery and Exploration**

CORTESÃO, ARMANDO. *Antônio Pereira and his map of Circa, 1545* (Geographical review, XXXIX (2), April, 1939, 205-25). Tells of an unknown Portuguese cartographer and the early representation of Newfoundland, lower California, the Amazon, and the Ladrões islands.

MORISON, S. E. *The second voyage of Christopher Columbus: From Cadiz to Hispaniola and the discovery of the Lesser Antilles*. Oxford: Clarendon Press. 1939. Pp. 112. (\$2.50). The author followed Columbus's track in a yacht, sailing at the same time of year. He has made some important corrections in the accepted beliefs about Columbus's course. The volume is well documented and contains excellent maps.

(3) **New France**

BERNEVAL. *Le contingent de filles de 1639* (B.R.H., XLV (1), janv., 1939, 3-15). The author puts forward a strong argument to refute a number of claims, notably that of the *Mercurre français* of 1646, that many women colonists to New France were drawn from the streets of Paris.

COLE, CHARLES WOOLSEY. *Colbert and a century of French mercantilism*. Vols. I and II. New York: Columbia University Press. 1939. Pp. xiv, 532; [vii], 675. (\$10.00 the set) To be reviewed later.

FAUTEUX, ÆGIDIUS. *Montcalm et "L'ami des hommes"* (Les Cahiers des Dix, no. 3, 1938, 115-30). *L'Ami des hommes* by the economist, Mirabeau, appeared in 1756. Montcalm was very much interested in this book, particularly in the section on "Colonies," excerpts from which are quoted in this study.

LA BRUÈRE, MONTARVILLE BOUCHER de. *Pierre Boucher colonisateur* (Les Cahiers des Dix, no. 3, 1938, 165-90). The efforts of Pierre Boucher (1622-1717) to establish the rather precariously situated colony of New France on a firmer footing began in 1663 and continued throughout his life. This account also deals with the development of his seigneurie at Boucherville.

MASSICOTTE, E.-Z. *L'Apprentissage au bon vieux temps* (B.R.H., XLIV (12), déc., 1938, 364-6). A discussion of apprenticeship in Canada in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries.

REX. *Chevaliers de Saint-Louis* (B.R.H., XLV (3), mars, 1939, 95-6). The order of Saint-Louis founded by Louis XIV in 1693 penetrated to Canada and became a mark of high distinction.

SEYMOUR, FLORA WARREN. *La Salle: Explorer of our midland empire*. New York, London: Appleton-Century Co. [Toronto: Ryerson Press]. 1939. Pp. xviii, 236. (\$2.25) The romantic story of La Salle's explorations, written primarily for the young reader.

TRICOCHE, GEORGES NESTLER. *Un des derniers épisodes de la lutte franco-anglaise au Canada: Le siège de Fort Beauséjour en 1775* (Revue historique, Librairie Félix Alcan, Paris, CLXXXII, janv.-juin, 1938, 322-32).

(4) **British North America before 1867**

Canada, Dominion of. *Report of the Public Archives for the year 1937 and 1938* (GUSTAVE LANTOT, keeper of public records.) Ottawa: King's Printer. 1938; 1939. Pp. xxx, 599-802; xxiv, A18, 175. (\$1.00 each) With the publication of these two volumes, the annual reports of the Public Archives have now been brought up to date. Among the many new and interesting acquisitions which are recorded in the reports, there may be mentioned the Sir John Willison collection and the papers of Senator Charles Murphy. The report for 1937 is accompanied by an appendix which contains the concluding section of the calendar of the G series for Upper Canada, together with an index of the entire Upper Canadian part of this series from 1796 to 1841. Appendix II of the report for 1938 contains a calendar of the papers of Lord

Dalhousie, 1816-1833, for which an index is also provided. In addition, the archivist has announced the projected publication of a number of other calendars of both old and new manuscript materials; and historians will be grateful for this steady accumulation of aids so essential to their research.

GOTTSCHALK, LOUIS. *The attitude of European officers in the revolutionary armies toward General George Washington* (Journal of Illinois State Historical Society, XXXII (1), March, 1939, 20-50).

GRAHAM, GERALD S. *Lord Castlereagh and the defence of British North America* (Canadian defence quarterly, XVI (2), Jan., 1939, 215-16). When an American attack on the British provinces threatened in 1807, Castlereagh considered concentrating on the defence of Newfoundland.

_____. *Napoleon's Baltic blockade and the birth of the Canadian timber trade* (Baltic and Scandinavian countries, Baltic Institute, Gdynia, Poland, V (1), Jan., 1939, 28-30).

HUBBART, HENRY CLYDE. *The older middle west, 1840-80: Its social, economic and political life and sectional tendencies before, during and after the Civil War*. London and New York: Appleton-Century Co. 1936. Pp. x, 306. This volume has some excellent material in the early chapters on economic growth in the lake country and on lake trade.

JAMES, ALFRED PROCTER (comp. and ed.). *Writings of General John Forbes: Relating to his service in North America*. (Allegheny county committee of the Pennsylvania Society of the Colonial Dames of America.) Menasha, Wisc.: Collegiate Press. 1938. Pp. xvi, 316. (\$3.50) To be reviewed later.

JAMES, JAMES ALTON. *Oliver Pollock: The life and times of an unknown patriot*. New York, London: Appleton-Century Co. 1937. Pp. xvi, 376. Pollock made a fortune in trade on the Mississippi just before the American Revolution, which he devoted to the support of George Rogers Clark in his campaign for the conquest of the Ohio country. The book has interesting information on western trade and diplomacy from 1760 to 1790.

LARSEN, ESTHER LOUISE (trans.). *Peter Kalm's short account of the natural position, use, and care of some plants, of which the seeds were recently brought home from North America for the service of those who take pleasure in experimenting with the cultivation of the same in our climate* (Agricultural history, XIII (1), Jan., 1939, 33-64). This is the first translation into English of a small pamphlet published in Stockholm in 1751.

LEACOCK, STEPHEN. *Charles Dickens and Canada* (Queen's quarterly, XLVI (1), spring, 1939, 28-37).

NANTEL, MARÉCHAL. *L'Affaire Walker* (B.R.H., XLIV (11), nov., 347-8). Conflict between civilians and the military element came to a head in Montreal in 1767 when an attack by a number of officers was made on Magistrate Thomas Walker.

PARES, RICHARD. *Colonial blockade and neutral rights, 1739-1763*. Oxford: At the Clarendon Press. 1938. Pp. x, 323. (21s.)

POULIOT, LÉON. *Que penser des frères Kirke?* (B.R.H., XLIV (11), nov., 321-35). Considers the question as to whether the Kirke brothers were French or British subjects when they led the expedition against Quebec in 1629.

SHAFROTH, JOHN F. *The capture of Louisbourg in 1758: A joint military and naval operation* (Proceedings, United States Naval Institute, LXIV, Jan., 1938, 78-88).

_____. *The capture of Quebec in 1759: A joint military and naval operation* (Proceedings, United States Naval Institute, LXIV, Feb., 1938, 187-201).

SUTHERLAND, ALEX H. *The Selkirk settlement on the Red River*. Victoria, B.C.: The author, 2800 Dewdney St. N.d. Pp. 61. In a long poem preceded by a prose introduction the author tells the story of Selkirk and his settlement.

VOSBURGH, FREDERICK G. *Henry Hudson, magnificent failure* (National geographic magazine, LXXV (4), April, 1939, 461-90). The story of Hudson's voyages.

WILD, ROLAND. *Macnab the last laird*. London: Methuen and Co. 1938. Pp. xii, 256. To be reviewed later.

(5) The Dominion of Canada

ANDERSON, VIOLET (ed.). *Problems in Canadian unity: Lectures given at the Canadian Institute on Economics and Politics, August 6 to 19, 1938*. Toronto: Thomas Nelson. 1938. Pp. x, 153. (\$1.50)

BRADY, A. *Royal commissions in the dominion: A note on current political practice* (University of Toronto quarterly, VIII (3), April, 1939, 284-92). A critical examination of the function, value, and current use of royal commissions in Canada.

Canada, Senate of. *Report pursuant to resolution of the senate to the honourable the speaker by the parliamentary counsel relating to: The enactment of the British North America Act, 1867, any lack of consonance between its terms and judicial construction of them and cognate matters. Session of 1939*. Ottawa: King's Printer. 1939. Pp. 18; Annex 1: 160; Annex 2: 132; Annex 3: 222; Annex 4: 154; Annex 5: 28. See p. 225.

Canada to-day. (British Isles ed.). Montreal: Bank of Montreal. 1938. Pp. [64]. A tourist booklet on the dominion and the provinces giving information with regard to natural resources, industries, etc.

Canadian Club of Toronto. *Addresses*. Vol. XXXV, season of 1937-38. Toronto: Warwick Bros. and Rutter. 1938. Pp. xiv, 352.

The C.C.F. movement (Round table, no. 113, Dec., 1938, 149-52).

CLARK, E. R. *The privy council and the constitution* (Dalhousie review, XIX (1), April, 1939, 65-75). The author concludes that "Many of the current views regarding the 'sovereignty of the Provinces', and many of the so-called 'Provincial rights' . . . have had their origin, not in the B.N.A. Act, but in the decisions of the Privy Council."

CLOUGH, OWEN (ed.). *Journal of the Society of Clerks-at-the-Table in empire parliaments*. Vol. VI. For 1937. London, Toronto: Butterworth and Co. 1938. Pp. 265. (\$5.00) Contains a chapter on "Canada: Constitutional reform" which deals with the appointment and terms of reference of the royal commission on dominion-provincial relations.

The Conservative convention (Round table, no. 112, Sept., 1938, 816-19). Comments on the national party convention which met at Ottawa, July, 1938.

A democratic front for Canada: Reports, speeches, resolutions of the dominion executive committee, Communist party of Canada held on June 3rd-6th, 1938 at Toronto. Toronto: New Era Publishers. 1938. Pp. 138. Includes speeches on "A democratic front for Canada" by TIM BUCK; "Building the communist party" by SAM CARR; and "Canada and world peace" by NORMAN FREED.

DENNY, CECIL E. *The law marches west*. Ed. and arranged by W. B. CAMERON. Foreword by A. C. RUTHERFORD. Toronto: J. M. Dent and Sons (Canada). 1939. Pp. xvi, 319. (\$3.00) To be reviewed later.

Empire Club of Canada. *Addresses delivered to the members during the year 1937-38*. Toronto: Printers Guild. 1938. Pp. x, 415. Includes the following addresses: "Canada and a united empire" by Sir EVELYN WRENCH; "The Royal Canadian Mounted Police" by Major-Gen. Sir JAMES H. MACBRIEN; "Problems of the British Empire" by GRAHAM HUTTON; "What does our empire mean to us?" by CHARLES A. DUNNING; "Canada's place in world affairs" by G. G. McGEER; "Canada's challenge to its youth" by NICHOLAS IGNATIEFF; "British Columbia and confederation" by T. D. PATULLO; "The handwriting on parliament's wall" by NORMAN M. MACLEOD; "Life and medical work on the Labrador" by C. HOGARTH FORSYTH.

- FRASER, C. F. *Judicial committee of the privy council: Its development and function* (Alberta law quarterly, III (4), April, 1939, 101-19). Attempts to evaluate the merits and defects of the committee as a final court of appeal for Canada.
- GORDON, CHARLES W. *Postscript to adventure: The autobiography of Ralph Connor*. New York: Farrar and Rinehart [Toronto: Oxford University Press]. 1938. Pp. xviii, 430. (\$3.00) See p. 221.
- HUNT, FRAZIER. *The little doc: The story of Allan Roy Dafee, physician to the quintuplets*. New York: Simon and Schuster. 1939. Pp. xii, 302. (\$2.25) A biography dedicated "To that valiant and self-sacrificing band of death-fighters, The Country Doctors of North America."
- INGLE, LORNE. *Control of the press* (Alberta law quarterly, III (4), April, 1939, 127-30). An inquiry as to where power over press and speech is vested in our federal constitution.
- LOWER, A. R. M. *Sir John A. Macdonald* (Dalhousie review, XIX (1), April, 1939, 85-90). An attempt "to look at the man and his career with relative lack of bias, and to make some judgment on him and on his place in Canadian life."
- MACDONALD, VINCENT C. *Constitutional interpretation and extrinsic evidence* (Canadian bar review, XVII (2), Feb., 1939, 77-93). By reference to various judicial decisions, the author examines the effect of extrinsic evidence on the constitutional interpretation of the B.N.A. Act and statutes whose validity depends on the act.
- MCWILLIAMS, R. F. *The amendment of the constitution* (Canadian bar review, XVI (6), June, 1938, 466-75). A legal analysis of the method by which amendments to the British North America Act should be made.
- NORMANDIN, A. L. (ed.). *Canadian parliamentary guide, 1938*. Hull, P.Q.: Labour Exchange. Pp. 705. (\$4.00)
- Politics on the prairies* (Round table, no. 112, Sept., 1938, 819-25). A note on social credit and the Saskatchewan election of 1938.
- PRÉVOST, ROLAND. *La confédération—le pour et le contre* (Revue populaire, juillet, 1938, 5). An analysis of confederation from a French-Canadian point of view.
- SCOTT, F. R. *Canada today: A study of her national interests and national policy*. With a foreword by E. J. TARR. Ed. 2 rev. Prepared for the British Commonwealth relations conference, 1938. London, Toronto, New York: Oxford University Press. 1939. Pp. xii, 184. See p. 199.
- The session at Ottawa* (Round table, no. 112, Sept., 1938, 809-16). Summarizes briefly the work of the Canadian parliament, 1937-8.
- Sir Ferozkhhan Noon in Canada, 1938*. London: India House. 1938. Pp. 19. Favourable impressions of a visitor from India, with interesting comparisons of Canada and India.
- STEVENSON, J. A. *Sir Andrew Macphail* (Canadian defence quarterly, XVI (2), Jan., 1939, 206-10).
- Survey of Canadian legislation* (University of Toronto law journal, III (1), lent term, 1939, 150-63). An annual survey which deals only with the more important statutes.
- TROTTER, REGINALD G. *Canada's new national outlook* (Events, V (26), Feb., 1939, 104-9). Points out that the precariousness of national security and symptoms of internal disunity are arousing Canada to need for national reorganization.
- UNDERHILL, FRANK H. *Canada faces an election* (Events, V (27), March, 1939, 199-204). Gives the general set-up of the political parties and reviews the main issues—unemployment, dominion-provincial relations, and foreign and defence policy—which face the leaders.

We propose: Resolutions adopted at the eighth dominion convention of the Communist party of Canada, held in Toronto, October 8-13, 1937. Toronto: New Era Publishers. 1937. Pp. 76. (10c.)

WILSON, CLIFFORD. *Indian treaties* (Beaver, outfit 269, no. 4, March, 1939, 38-41). The story of the series of treaties by which the Indians of southern Canada yielded up their rights to the soil.

(6) The Great War

GRAFTON, C. S. *The Canadian "Emma Gees": A history of the Canadian Machine Gun Corps.* Toronto: Canadian Machine Gun Corps Association [London, Ont.: Wendell Holmes]. 1938. Pp. 218. To be reviewed later.

STACEY, C. P. *Canada's last war—and the next* (University of Toronto quarterly, VIII (3), April, 1939, 247-54). A review-article on the *Official history of the Canadian forces in the Great War* by A. Fortescue Duguid (Ottawa, 1938).

IV. PROVINCIAL AND LOCAL HISTORY

(1) The Maritime Provinces

BLAIR, W. SAXBY. *Land settlement in the Maritimes* (Public affairs, II (3), March, 1939, 110-13).

HARVEY, D. C. (ed.). *The heart of Howe: Selections from the letters and speeches of Joseph Howe.* Foreword by the Hon. ANGUS L. MACDONALD. Toronto: Oxford University Press. 1939. Pp. xx, 197. (\$1.50) To be reviewed later.

HAYTHORNE, GEORGE V. *Canada-United States Trade Agreement and the Maritime Provinces* (Public affairs, II (3), March, 1939, 136-40).

MCLEAN, CHARLES HERBERT. *Prominent people of New Brunswick.* Saint John, N.B.: Biographical Society of Canada. 1938. Pp. 261. (\$10.00)

Nova Scotia, Public Archives of, Board of Trustees. *Report for the year ended 30th November, 1938.* Halifax, N.S.: King's Printer. 1939. Pp. 67. In an appendix is given a complete section of the original census of 1827, dealing with the upper district of the county of Sydney (now Antigonish county).

SAUNDERS, S. A. *Studies in the economy of the Maritime Provinces.* Preface by H. A. INNIS. (Studies of the Institute of Public Affairs at Dalhousie University.) Toronto: Macmillan Co. of Canada. 1939. Pp. xiv, 266. (\$2.00) To be reviewed later.

(2) The Province of Quebec

BARBEAU, MARIUS. *Nos traditions* (Revue trimestrielle canadienne, 24^{ème} année (95), sept., 1938, 290-9). The author predicts eventual assimilation of French Canadians into the North American culture.

The birth of the Eastern Townships (Brome County Historical Society, n.s., no. 1, 1937, 1-5). Traces the history of the Eastern Townships in Quebec to the granting of the first township, Dunham, in 1796.

GUILBAULT, PAUL E. *In defense of Quebec* (Catholic world, N.Y., July, 1938, 428-32).

HENDRIE, LILIAN M. *Montreal: "A grain of mustard seed"* (Ontario library review, XXIII (1), Feb., 1939, 20-2).

HOGNER, DOROTHY CHILDS. *Summer roads to Gaspé.* Illustrated by NILS HOGNER. New York: E. P. Dutton and Co. [Toronto: Smithers and Bonellie]. 1939. Pp. 288. (\$4.00) A pleasant guide-book to the Gaspé peninsula, attractively printed and bound, with delightful illustrations and an index.

LA FORCE, J. E. *Colonization in the province of Quebec* (Public affairs, II (3), March, 1939, 118-21). An account of present needs and plans.

- MASSICOTTE, E.-Z. *Au temps des Maquignons* (B.R.H., XLV (3), mars, 1939, 81-3). Tells of events surrounding two famous horse markets in Montreal in the middle nineteenth century.
- *Les deux premiers avocats Bibaud* (B.R.H., XLIV (11), nov., 340-3). A brief account of Pierre Bibaud and Jean-Jacques-Evariste Bibaud, his son, born in 1787 and 1827 respectively, and the part they played in the Montreal of their day.
- *Evocations du vieux Montréal* (Les Cahiers des Dix, no. 3, 1938, 131-64). Landmarks and personalities of Montreal in the last three centuries are presented.
- *Type montréalais d'autrefois* (B.R.H., XLV (1), janv., 1939, 30-2). Le Père Breton (Yves Lescoat) was a fruit seller to be seen on the streets of Montreal around 1885.
- MINER, HORACE. *St. Denis: A French-Canadian parish*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press [Toronto: University of Toronto Press]. 1939. Pp. xx, 283. (\$3.00) To be reviewed later.
- ROUCEK, J. S. *Problem francouzských Kanadanů* (Narodnostřů Olzor, Prague, June, 1938, 265-70). Discusses the problem of the French Canadians.
- ROY, PIERRE-GEORGES. *La bande de Chambers* (Les Cahiers des Dix, no. 3, 1938, 89-113). Charles Chambers was the leader of a band of ruffians who terrorized the city of Quebec in 1834 and 1835.
- TESSIER, ALBERT. *Deux enrichis: Aaron Hart et Nicolas Montour* (Les Cahiers des Dix, no. 3, 1938, 217-42). The greater part of this account of the two business men of Three Rivers is given over to inventories of their possessions. That of Aaron Hart dates from 1801 and Nicolas Montour's from 1808 and 1810.
- TRUELLE, PIERRE. *L'Abitibi d'autrefois, d'hier, d'aujourd'hui*. Amos, P.Q.: Chez l'auteur. 1937. Pp. 397. (\$3.00) The author introduces his account of settlement and economic development in this section of northern Quebec with a brief history of the region from 1686 to the present.
- (3) **The Province of Ontario**
- COWAN, HUGH. *Gold and silver jubilee, Sault Ste. Marie, Canada, incorporated a town, 1887, a city, 1912: Year book, 1937*. Sault Ste. Marie. 1938. Pp. 32.
- FIELD, Mrs. EDITH. *The good old days: A true record of pioneer life on the North American continent*. Detroit: Duo-art Press. 1938. Pp. 26. Deals with pioneer life in Oxford county, Ontario.
- INNIS, H. A. *Toronto and the Toronto Board of Trade* (Commerce journal, University of Toronto Commerce Club, March, 1939, 19-24). An historical survey of the part played by the board of trade in the economic and political life of the city.
- KINNIBURGH, JAMES. *Ottawa the capital*. London: Arthur H. Stockwell. [1938]. Pp. 32. (2s.) A brief historical description.
- NICHOLS, D. A. *The geographic setting of northern Ontario* (Canadian geographical journal, XVIII (3), March, 1939, 147-51). A consideration of the Laurentian upland, the Hudson bay coastal plain, and the Ontario lowland.
- ROBERTS, LLOYD. *Land of romance: Northern and north-western Ontario* (Canadian geographical journal, XVIII (3), March, 1939, 115-45). Beautifully illustrated.
- (4) **The Prairie Provinces**
- BRITNELL, G. E. *The wheat economy*. Editor's preface by H. A. INNIS. (Political economy series, no. 4; published by the University of Toronto Press and the Canadian Institute of International Affairs.) Toronto: The University of Toronto Press. 1939. Pp. xviii, 260. (\$2.50) To be reviewed later.
- CAMPBELL, MARJORIE WILKINS. *The soil is not enough*. Toronto: Macmillan Co. of Canada. 1938. Pp. viii, 285. (\$2.25) This book falls between autobiography,

biography, and fiction. It is the story of the author's father and gives an authentic picture of settler life in the west.

CONNOR, A. J. *The climate of Manitoba*. Published by economic survey board, province of Manitoba, February, 1939. Pp. xii, 163.

MACFARLANE, R. O. *A law-abiding rebel: John Christian Schultz* (Manitoba arts review, I (3), spring, 1939, 21-6). Some facts about the career of Sir John Schultz, lieutenant-governor of Manitoba, 1888-95.

Report on rural relief due to drought conditions and crop failures in western Canada, 1930-1937. Ottawa: Department of Agriculture. 1939. Pp. 130.

STEWART, ALISTAIR M. *The youth problem of Manitoba*. Winnipeg: Manitoba Economic Survey Board. 1939. Pp. [iv], 42 (mimeo.).

(5) British Columbia and the North-west Coast

ANDERSON, BERN (ed.). *The Vancouver expedition: Peter Puget's journal of the exploration of Puget sound, May 7-June 11, 1792* (Pacific northwest quarterly, XXX (2), April, 1939, 177-217). The document herein printed is a portion of the complete Puget journal in the Public Record Office which comprises two manuscript volumes and is a logbook of the Vancouver expedition from 1791 to 1795.

BANWELL, SELWYN. *A frontier judge: British justice in the earliest days of farthest west*. Toronto: Rous and Mann. 1938. Pp. 30. An interesting sketch of the life and times of Sir Matthew Baillie Begbie, first chief justice of British Columbia. (Reprinted in *Canadian bar review*, XVI (7), Sept., 1938, 550-65.)

BROWN, GEORGE D. and LAMB, W. KAYE. *Captain St. Paul of Kamloops* (British Columbia historical quarterly, III (2), April, 1939, 115-27). An account of the life of the picturesque Indian, Jean Baptiste Lolo, 1798-1868, long associated with the Kamloops district.

FUTCHER, WINNIFRED M. (ed.). *The great north road to the Cariboo*. Vancouver, B.C.: Roy Wrigley Printing and Publishing Co. 1938. Pp. 113. This is a kind of guide-book of the Cariboo road. The first 46 pages contain an accurate but scanty and incomplete sketch of the golden days of Cariboo and of its famous road, with short chapters on the transportation of early times and on the gold escorts. The remainder takes the form of a trip along the road today with casual references to interesting persons and events connected with the villages and towns on the route. The book is plainly intended for the tourist, who will find its information, as far as it goes, reliable. It is beautifully bound, well printed and illustrated. [F. W. HOWAY]

LAING, F. W. *Hudson's Bay Company lands on the mainland of British Columbia, 1858-1861* (British Columbia historical quarterly, III (2), April, 1939, 75-99).

SHIELS, ARCHIE W. (ed.). *The San Juan islands*. Juneau, Alaska: Empire Printing Co. Private ed. 1938. Pp. 275. To be reviewed later.

(6) North-west Territories, Labrador, and the Arctic Regions

GARDNER, G. *La frontière Canada-Labrador* (Revue trimestrielle canadienne, 24ème année (95), sept., 1938, 272-89). Considers various documents bearing on the Canada-Labrador-Newfoundland frontiers from the Treaty of Paris to the decision of the privy council in 1927.

GRANGE, MARION. *Life in the eastern Arctic* (Royal Bank magazine, Jan., 1939, 4-11, 22).

LLOYD-OWEN, FRANCES. *Gold Nugget Charlie: A narrative compiled from the notes of Charles E. Masson*. London, Toronto: George G. Harrap and Co. 1939. Pp. 260. To be reviewed later.

- MONTAGUE, SYDNEY R. *North to adventure*. New York: Robert M. McBride and Co. [Toronto: George J. McLeod]. 1939. Pp. 284. (\$2.25) To be reviewed later.
- NEWTON, KATHLEEN. *The northland of Canada* (Nineteenth century, DCCXLIII, Jan., 1939, 73-9). Considers the northland as the source of valuable natural resources and as a possible route from Great Britain to the far east.
- PLATT, RAYE R. *Recent exploration in the polar regions* (Geographical review, XXIX (2), April, 1939, 303-9).
- STEFANSSON, VILHJALMUR. *The lost 9000* (Canadian magazine, XCI (1), Jan., 1939, 8-9, 35-8). A condensation from the first chapter of *Unsolved mysteries of the Arctic*, tells of the tragedy of the earliest European inhabitants of Greenland.

(7) Newfoundland

- GARDNER, GÉRARD. *Terre-Neuve, île étrange* (Actualité économique, II (2), déc., 1938, 101-15). A brief historical account of Newfoundland from early explorations to the establishment of the commission in 1934, together with a discussion of present political and economic conditions.

V. GEOGRAPHY, ECONOMICS, AND STATISTICS

(1) General

- COHEN, MAXWELL. *The Canadian anti-trust laws—doctrinal and legislative beginnings* (Canadian bar review, XVI (6), June, 1938, 439-65). Examines the history of Canada's "trust" problem and attempts to estimate the extent to which the dominion has limited monopoly and other restraints on competitive activity.
- HANSEN, A. H. *Canadian monetary policy* (Manitoba arts review, I (3), spring, 1939, 32-8). A summary of a submission made upon behalf of the Manitoba government before the royal commission on dominion-provincial relations; with introduction and explanatory notes by R. McQUEEN.
- KEMP, H. R. (ed.). *Canadian marketing problems: Ten essays*. Toronto: The University of Toronto Press. 1939. Pp. viii, 152. (\$2.50) The essays on various marketing topics contained in this volume are based upon material presented in a series of lectures given at the University of Toronto under the joint auspices of the department of political economy (course in commerce and finance), the department of university extension, and the Advertising and Sales Club of Toronto, and the present volume is the third to be issued in the political economy series commenced in 1938. The titles and authors of the essays are: "The commercial policy of Canada" by K. W. TAYLOR; "The statistical basis of marketing policy" by HERBERT MARSHALL; "Marketing Canadian goods abroad" by H. LAUREYS; "Retailing from the consumer's point of view" by WALTER THOMPSON; "Improving merchandising and marketing methods through research" by D. R. G. COWAN; "New problems in advertising and steps towards their solution" by HENRY KING; "Some aspects of resale price maintenance" by C. A. CURTIS; "The farm market" by JOHN MARTIN; "Recent developments in co-operative marketing" by J. E. LATTIMER; "Some aspects of the pricing problem" by H. R. KEMP.
- KING, W. CORNWALLIS. *Caribou hunt, told to Mary Weekes* (Beaver, outfit 269, no. 4, March, 1939, 45-7). Reminiscences by an old-timer.
- LAMB, FRANK H. *Sagas of the evergreens: The story and the economic, social and cultural contribution of the evergreen trees and forests of the world*. New York: W. W. Norton & Co. [Toronto: George J. McLeod]. 1938. Pp. 364. (\$4.00) To be reviewed later.
- McWILLIAMS, R. F. *The constitution and banking* (Canadian banker, April, 1939, 279-87).
- MOONEY, GEO. S. *Co-operatives today and tomorrow: A Canadian survey*. Montreal: Survey Committee. 1938. Pp. 189. (35c.)

RICHTER, L. (ed.). *Canada's unemployment problem* by H. M. CASSIDY, W. L. JACOBSON, W. M. JONES, DOROTHY KING, A. MACNAMARA, L. RICHTER, W. A. SAUNDERS, H. A. WEIR, CHARLOTTE WHITTON. With a foreword by Hon. NORMAN McL. ROGERS. (Studies of the Institute of Public Affairs at Dalhousie University.) Toronto: Macmillan Co. of Canada. 1939. Pp. xvi, 414. To be reviewed later.

Uncle Bart. *Now take Canada*. Toronto: Commonwealth Publishers. 1939. Pp. xiv, 170. The author analyses present economic disorders in Canada and finds that the solution lies in the application of the "natural law of value," that is the law of supply and demand, which "if free to operate, would regulate the prices of all goods and commodities."

(2) Agriculture

GRANT, J. FERGUS. *Implementing agriculture* (Canadian geographical journal, XVIII (4), April, 1939, 171-207). This illustrated account of the development of agricultural machinery in Canada includes a short history of the Massey-Harris Company.

NEWMAN, L. H. *New wheat creations and their significance to Canada* (Canadian geographical journal, XVIII (4), April, 1939, 208-16).

(3) Geography

BRUCE, E. L. *The Canadian shield and its geographic effects* (Geographical journal, XCIII (3), March, 1939, 230-9). Describes the shield and discusses its effect upon human geography.

VI. RELIGIOUS HISTORY

Aylmer's splendid history: From the pioneer days of 1816 to the present time (Canadian Baptist, LXXXV (19), May 11, 1939, 5-6, 8). A brief history of a Baptist church in Elgin county, Ontario.

BESTERMAN, THEODORE (ed.). *The travels and sufferings of Father Jean de Brébeuf among the Hurons of Canada as described by himself*. Translated from the French and Latin by the editor. London: Golden Cockerel Press. 1938. Pp. 199. This is a significant bit of book-making and printing, well suited for a display piece in a private library, and for the hands of the bibliophile. There seems but little other reason for publishing Brébeuf's writings which are available to historical scholars in a satisfactory form in all well-equipped libraries. [R. M. S.]

BUXTON, GEORGE. *Some aspects of the religious policy of Great Britain in the province of Quebec, 1760-1774* (Canadian Catholic Historical Association report, 1937-8, 17-23). Presents documentary evidence to show how politics influenced British religious policy.

Canadian churchman, LXVI, 1939, Series of articles on centenarian parishes in Ontario: *Church of St. John the Evangelist, Stamford* (Jan. 12); *St. George's Church, Guelph* (Jan. 19); *St. George's Church, St. Catharines* (Jan. 26); *Grace Church, Brantford* (Feb. 16); *Church in Barrie and Allandale* (March 2); *Parish of Adolphustown* (April 6); *Trinity Church, Chippawa* (April 27).

CARON, IVANHOÉ. *Le diocèse de Québec: Divisions et subdivisions de 1674 à 1844* (Canadian Catholic Historical Association report, 1937-8, 11-47). Vicissitudes attending the history of the diocese of Quebec from the time when it included the valleys of the St. Lawrence and the Mississippi and the region west of the latter region with the exception of California.

Monseigneur Joseph-Octave Plessis, curé de Notre-Dame de Québec (1792-1805) (Mém. S.R.C., série 3, XXXII, sect. 1, mai, 1938, 21-40).

CHERRY, LEETA McCULLY. *Sixty years of growing, Parkdale Presbyterian Church, Toronto: Diamond jubilee, 1879-1939*. Toronto: T. H. Best Printing Co. 1939. Pp. 23.

- Churchill United Church, Esquimes, 1838-1938. Compiled on the occasion of the centennial celebration of the organization of the Churchill congregation as one of the congregational churches of Canada. Acton, Ont.: Free Press. [1938]. Pp. 22.
- COFFEY, AGNES. *The true witness and Catholic chronicle* (Canadian Catholic Historical Association report, 1937-8, 33-46). The story of the founder (George Edward Clerk) of this Catholic newspaper which existed from 1850-1910, and his successors.
- DOULL, JOHN. *Reverend Alexander McGillivray, D.D.* Halifax, N.S. 1938. Pp. 24. The life of Dr. McGillivray (1801-62), who immigrated to Nova Scotia in 1832, is told against the background of the early history of the Scottish church in Canada.
- DUFFIN, Mother MARY G. *A heroine of charity: Venerable Mother d'Youville, foundress of the Sisters of Charity Grey Nuns, Montreal, 1701-1777.* New York: Benziger Brothers. 1938. Pp. 197. (\$1.75) To be reviewed later.
- GARLAND, M. A. (ed.). *The Proudfoot papers* (Ontario Historical Society, papers and records, XXXII, 1937, 92-103). This instalment of the diary of the Rev. William Proudfoot of London, Ontario, includes the period August, 1839, to Sept., 1848, and deals, among other things, with parochial matters, the *Presbyterian magazine*, and the opening of the Theological Institute in London.
- GARRAGHAN, GILBERT J. *The Jesuits of the middle United States.* In 3 volumes. New York: America Press. 1938. Pp. xiv, 660; x, 699; x, 666. (\$10.00) To be reviewed later.
- GOWER, G. P. *An historical review of the diocese of Edmonton* (Canadian churchman, LXVI (20), May 18, 1939, 313). The same issue also contains a descriptive and historical account of "some churches of Edmonton."
- HOTSON, ZELLA M. *Pioneer Baptist work in Oxford county.* Innerkip, Ont.: The author. Pp. 52. (50c.) Miss Hotson has for some years past been delving industriously into the history of the Baptist church in her own county and in this booklet sets forth concisely and clearly the advance of the denomination from the arrival of the first Baptist families around 1800 down to recent times. Miss Hotson has consulted available church records over a period of years. Two maps aid in an understanding of the locality studied. Such studies as this are of value and more such would be welcome. [FRED LANDON]
- JOUE, ODORIC-M. *Les titulaires des deux premières églises de Québec* (B.R.H., XLIV (9), sept., 1938, 257-73). The author considers various sources dealing with the question of the original titles given to two churches founded in Quebec in 1615 and 1620-1 respectively.
- KELLEY, A. R. *The establishment of the colonial episcopate.* [Compton, P.Q., The author, King's Hall.] 1937. Pp. 8. The text of a paper read at a meeting in Halifax, held under the joint auspices of the general synod of the Church of England, and the Nova Scotia Historical Society.
- MCDOWELL, FRANKLIN DAVEY. *Before the pioneers* (Canadian magazine, XCI (1), Jan., 1939, 16-17, 42-4). The story of Fort Ste. Marie on the Wye river, Ontario, which was constructed in 1639 as headquarters of the Jesuit mission to the Hurons.
- MCLAURIN, C. C. *Sixty years in the ministry.* Edmonton: Institute Press. 1937. Pp. 13.
- MILLMAN, THOMAS R. *Joseph Braithwaite and the Bishop Stewart Theological Seminary at Chambly, 1828-1838* (Montreal churchman, XXVII (5), May, 1939, 20-2).
Training of theological students in the old diocese of Quebec (Montreal churchman, XXVII (4), April, 1939, 16-19).
- Monatshefte der Oblaten der Unbefleckten Jungfrau Maria.* Nrs. 10, Oct., 1938, & 5, May, 1939. Hünfeld, Hessen-Nassau. Both these numbers contain very interesting and instructive illustrated articles by Father Paul Schultze, O.M.I. (the

"Fliegerpater") about his air journeys in the mission plane *Miva* in the Arctic, both as a missionary, and on his work of rescuing victims of illness and accident. The two articles are "Zwischen Polarkreis und Magnetpol," and "Tragbare und Tabernakel." They and the photographs illustrating them are excellent, and eloquent of the work done by devoted missionaries "mid snow and ice." Of particular interest are those pictures showing how a patient (Father Cochard) is carried over the snow to the *Miva* at Igluik, and the picture of Father Schultze standing alone on a vast field of ice, faintly illuminated by the midnight sun, as he gazes at a cross made of sticks. Under this are the touching words: "Hier versank ein Mensch im ewigen Eis." The value of the many articles and illustrations appearing nearly every month in the *Monatsblätter* should be again emphasized. They present us with up-to-date material on the work of the Oblate fathers, as well as on life and conditions beyond the Arctic circle, and are an important contribution to our knowledge of life and conditions in the Canadian north. [LOUIS HAMILTON]

O'CONNOR, THOMAS F. *Some non-Catholic contributions to the study of the Canadian American missions* (Canadian Catholic Historical Association report, 1937-8, 11-16). Includes notes on the works of Francis Parkman, R. G. Thwaites, the Right Rev. William Kip, and the Rev. Charles Hawley.

ROBITAILLE, GEORGES. *Marie de l'Incarnation: D'après la deuxième partie de sa correspondance* (Mém. S.R.C., série 3, XXXII, sect. 1, mai, 1938, 115-32). A study of the correspondence of Marie de l'Incarnation between 1652 and 1672 which throws an interesting light upon her religious life.

RUMILLY, ROBERT. *Mgr Lafitche et son temps*. (Collection du Zodiaque deuxième.) Montréal: Editions du Zodiaque. 1938. Pp. 425. (\$1.00) To be reviewed later.

[SHATFORD, Canon ALLAN P.]. *He... yet speaketh: Glimpses of the life work of*. Introduction by ARTHUR H. MOORE. Toronto: Musson. 1938. Pp. xvi, 250. (\$1.75) Canon Shatford, clergyman and author, was born in 1873 and died in 1935.

SIPPRELL, W. J. *The Western recorder: A pioneer in religious journalism* (Western recorder, XV (61), May, 1939, 3-7). A brief history of a British Columbian Methodist journal, founded forty years ago.

SPRAGGE, GEORGE W. (ed.). *The church in Upper Canada, 1815* (Canadian churchman, LXVI (19), May 11, 1939, 293). A survey made by the Rev. John Strachan in 1815 is reproduced.

TALMAN, J. J. *The first bishop of the diocese of Toronto* (Canadian churchman, LXVI (19), May 11, 1939, 292, 303). A sympathetic effort to show the human side of John Strachan.

— *Some notes on the clergy of the Church of England in Upper Canada prior to 1840* (R.S.C. transactions, ser. 3, XXXII, sect. 2, May, 1938, 57-66). An attempt to describe the antecedents, training, and character of some of the lesser clergy.

Toronto's daughter dioceses (Canadian churchman, LXVI (19), May 11, 1939, 294-5, 299). Brief sketches of the history of the dioceses of Huron, Ontario, Algoma, Niagara, and Ottawa.

TRAQUAIR, RAMSAY. *The church of St. John the Baptist, St. Jean Port Joli, Que.* (McGill University publications, series XIII (art and architecture), no. 41; reprinted from Journal, Royal Architectural Institute of Canada, Feb., 1939.) Montreal: Royal Architectural Institute of Canada. 1939. Pp. 11. An historical and architectural account of this attractive little church on the south shore of the St. Lawrence which was begun some time between 1775 and 1780 and finally completed in 1825 after a number of architects, notably Jean Baillargé and Jean Chrysostome Perrault, had had a hand in embellishing it. Photographs and drawings are included.

WENGER, JOHN C. *History of the Mennonites of the Franconia conference*. Telford, Penn.: Franconia Mennonite Historical Society. 1937. Pp. xvi, 523. (\$2.25)

In recent years the Mennonite churches in America have made noteworthy contributions to their written history. In addition to the publication of an historical quarterly there have appeared several regional histories (including one of Ontario), to which that of the Franconia conference is now added. Franconia, in eastern Pennsylvania, is the mother conference of Mennonites in America. Within its bounds the historic "Eighteen Articles of Dortrecht" were adopted in 1725 as the official confession of American Mennonitism, while from its loins have sprung Mennonite settlements in Virginia, western Pennsylvania, Ohio, and Ontario. After an introductory section in which the background of the sect is sketched, the author presents the histories of the thirty-six congregations within the conference with a list of the ministers. Mennonite activities are then described as are also the schisms which have produced new branches of the church. There is an appendix of historical documents; an extensive bibliography; and three separate indexes, of names, of places, congregations, and ships, and of subjects, books, and periodicals. Though references to Canada are not numerous the work has importance as providing a part of the background of Mennonitism in this country. [FRED LANDON]

WHELAN, LAWRENCE P. *The parish of St. Columban* (Canadian Catholic Historical Association report, 1937-8, 25-31). A brief history of a small parish north of Montreal.

VII. GENEALOGY

AUDET, FRANCIS-J. *Les Mondelet* (Les Cahiers des Dix, no. 3, 1938, 191-216). Dominique Mondelet, the first member of this family to come to Canada, arrived in 1755. This account deals with his descendants to the year 1868.

DESJARDINS, G.-A. *La famille Renouf* (B.R.H., XLV (1), janv., 1939, 17-22). The first Renouf to come to Canada was Philippe-Thomas, sailor and fisherman, who settled on the Gaspé peninsula and was drowned at sea in 1802. This account deals in brief fashion with his descendants.

HELWIG, MRS. SOLOMON and HELWIG, MRS. JOHN A. (comps.). *A history of the Diebel family: Tracing the descendants of Johann Heinrich Diebel, born March 18, 1736—died October 18, 1813; and his wife Anna Katherine Glebe, born May 5, 1744—died April 20, 1798*. Hanover, Ont.: Hanover Post Press. 1936. Pp. 93.

LA ROQUE DE ROQUEBRUNE, R. *Les ancêtres du marquis de Montcalm* (Revue de l'Université d'Ottawa, IX (1), janv.-mars, 1939, 33-47). This genealogical study reveals the fact that Louis XV and Montcalm were descended from a common ancestor.

MALCHELOSSE, GÉRARD. *La famille Niort de la Noraye*. Montréal: Les Editions des Dix. 1938. Pp. 30. Louis de Niort, sieur de la Noraye, was an officer in the Carignan regiment who settled in New France after the campaign of 1665-7 against the Iroquois. This study follows the fortunes of the family to 1716.

MORIN, VICTOR. *Les Ramezay et leur château*. Montréal: Les Editions des Dix. 1939. Pp. 75. Claude de Ramezay, founder of the Canadian dynasty, came to New France as a lieutenant in the Marine troops in 1685. This sketch gives the story of his descendants and of the château built by Claude de Ramezay for his residence as governor of Montreal in 1705.

ROUTIER, RENÉ. *La famille Routier: Dispersée en Amérique du Nord depuis trois cents ans. Notes généalogiques collectionnées*. 1ère éd. St. Adrien d'Irlande, P.Q.: The Author. 1937. Pp. [iii], 29 (mimeo.). Genealogical data concerning this family collected from correspondence and parish registers. The attractive printing and illustrations are the work of the author.

ROY, LÉON. *Dix générations dans la même paroisse* (B.R.H., XLIV (9), sept., 1938, 283-6). A biographical account of the Langlois family, the first member of which, Nicolas Langlois, came to Canada in 1666 and established himself at Pointe-aux-Trembles in 1668.

ROY, PIERRE-GEORGES. *La famille de Rigaud de Vaudreuil*. Quebec: Archives of the Province. 1938. Pp. 216. A competent genealogical study in the best French-Canadian manner of a family whose best-known member was the unfortunate governor of New France who had to stand trial for fraud after the cession of the colony to England. Vaudreuil was officially exonerated. His name has been cleared further of the taint of corruption in recent researches. [R. M. S.]

La famille Larue (B.R.H., XLV (3), mars, 1939, 65-71). Brief biographical sketches of a number of the descendants of Guillaume de Larue who came to New France around 1663.

SCOTT, W. L. *A.U.E. Loyalist family* (Ontario Historical Society, Papers and records, XXXII, 1937, 140-70). Traces the history of John Macdonell of Leek, Allan Macdonell of Collachie, and Alexander Macdonell of Aberchalder, Scottish Highlanders, and of their descendants.

VIII. BIBLIOGRAPHY

ABBOTT, MAUDE E. (ed.). *Classified and annotated bibliography of Sir William Osler's publications*. (Based on the chronological bibliography by MINNIE WRIGHT BLOGG.) Ed. 2, revised and indexed. Montreal: Medical Museum, McGill University. 1939. Pp. xvi, 163. (\$2.25) This volume is reprinted, with additions, from *Sir William Osler memorial volume* of the International Association of Medical Museums (bull. IX), edited by Maude E. Abbott (Toronto, 1926). Revisions and corrections have been made and an index has been added. From the point of view of the historian, the most interesting sections are those on "Medical education, medical societies, medical profession" and "Public welfare activities (including European war)."

Annual bulletin of historical literature, no. XXVII: *Dealing with publications of the year 1937*. London: G. Bell and Sons. 1938. Pp. 67. (1s. 6d.)

ARCHIBALD, EUGENIE (comp.). *Catalogue of the William Inglis Morse collection of books, pictures, maps, manuscripts, etc., at Dalhousie University Library, Halifax, Nova Scotia*. With a foreword by CARLETON STANLEY and a preface by WILLIAM INGLIS MORSE. London: Curwen Press. 1938. Pp. [7], 119.

BATESON, NORA. *Prince Edward island's library* (Public affairs, I (3), March, 1938, 102-5).

BEALS, HELEN D. *A catalogue of the Eric R. Dennis collection of Canadiana in the library of Acadia University*. Prepared under the direction of MARY KINLEY INGRAHAM. Wolfville, N.S.: Acadia University. 1938. Pp. [vi], 212. This valuable collection of Canadiana was described in this REVIEW, March, 1938, 121. It has now been efficiently catalogued and indexed. The arrangement of the catalogue is chronological up to 1900; after that date all books and pamphlets are listed in one alphabetical file.

Canada, Dominion bureau of statistics. *Survey of libraries in Canada, 1936-38*. (Being part III of the *Biennial survey of education in Canada, 1936-38*.) Ottawa: King's Printer. 1939. Pp. 74. (35c.)

Dominion, British Columbia, Ontario and Quebec government publications, 1938. Received by the inspector of public libraries. Toronto: King's Printer. 1938. Pp. 19.

DOUGLAS, JESSE S. *Guide to The Washington historical quarterly and The Pacific northwest quarterly, 1906-1938* (Pacific northwest quarterly, XXIX (4), Oct., 1938, 339-416).

GILROY, MARION. *The county histories of Nova Scotia* (Public affairs, II (1), Aug., 1938, 30-3).

GRIFFIN, GRACE GARDNER (ed.). *Writings on American history, 1932: A bibliography of books and articles on United States and Canadian history published during the year 1932, with some memoranda on other portions of America*. Washington: United States Government Printing Office. 1937. Pp. xxvi, 422.

GRIFFIN, GRACE GARDNER, LOURAINÉ, DOROTHY M., and TATE, KATHERINE M. *Writings on American history, 1933: A bibliography of books and articles on United States and Canadian history published during the year 1933, with some memoranda on other portions of America*. Washington: United States Government Printing Office. 1937. Pp. xxxii, 410.

Guide to depositories of manuscript collections in the United States. Prepared by the historical records survey, division of women's and professional projects, Works Progress Administration. (100 sample copies.) Columbus, Ohio: The Historical Records Survey. 1938. Pp. [iii], 134 (mimeo.). This mimeographed volume constitutes a preview of what the complete guide will be. Sample entries are included from each state. In every case, the library, historical society, or department of archives (alphabetically arranged) is described with a brief note on its history and purpose; its manuscript holdings are concisely listed, and information is given as to their cataloguing and availability.

Interesting books in Canadian history (School, Ontario College of Education, XXVII (5), Jan., 1939, 428-34; (6), Feb., 1939, 528-32; (7), March, 1939, 614-18). The continuation and final instalment of a list published in the December issue; prepared by the publications committee of the Toronto regional group of school and intermediate librarians.

JARVIS, HOPE. *University of New Brunswick Library* (Canadian bookman, XX (6), Feb.-March, 10-13).

KYTE, E. C. *Queen's University [Library]* (Canadian bookman, XX (5), Dec.-Jan., 1938, 10-12).

LANCOUR, A. HAROLD. *Passenger lists of ships coming to North America, 1607-1825: A bibliography*. New York: New York Public Library. 1938. Pp. 26. Reprinted with revisions and additions from the *Bulletin* of the New York Public Library of May, 1937.

LEWIN, EVANS. *Publications in the library of the Royal Empire Society on place names in the overseas empire* (Bulletin of the Institute of Historical Research, XVI (48), Feb., 1939, 168-80). Includes sections on Canada and its provinces.

List of books, pamphlets, atlases, almanacs and newspapers relating to the Eastern Townships [P.Q.] (Brome County Historical Society, n.s., no. 1, 1937, 41-59).

MILNE, ALEXANDER TAYLOR (comp.). *Writings on British history, 1934*. London: Royal Historical Society. 1937. Pp. 427. No attempt is made to include complete bibliographies, for which readers are referred to the CANADIAN HISTORICAL REVIEW. There are, however, brief lists of books and articles on Canadian history having a direct relation to Great Britain.

Revolutionary war manuscripts in possession of the Marblehead Historical Society (Essex Institute historical collections, LXXV (1), Jan., 1939, 15-22).

Toronto Public Library. *Canadian catalogue of books published in Canada, about Canada, as well as those written by Canadians, with imprint of 1937*. No. 16. Toronto: The Library. Pp. 56. (50c.)

IX. ART AND LITERATURE

AXFORD, PHILLIS. *Marketing Canadian magazines* (Commerce journal, University of Toronto Commerce Club, March, 1939, 24-30).

BARBEAU, MARIUS. *Ceintures fléchées* (Mém. S.R.C., série 3, XXXII, sect. 1, mai, 1938, 109-14). The history of the making of the *fléché* (woven sash) amongst Indians and French Canadians since the discovery of America.

BUCHANAN, DONALD W. *The story of Canadian art* (Canadian geographical journal, XVII (6), Dec., 1938, 273-94). Beautifully illustrated.

- CHARTIER, EMILE. *La vie de l'esprit au Canada français; oe étude; Les arts: Architecture, peinture, sculpture, musique* (Mém. S.R.C., série 3, XXXII, sect. 1, mai, 1938, 41-54). The author indicates the influence of France on these four branches of French-Canadian art.
- COLGATE, W. E. *Arthur Heming, recorder of the north*. Toronto: Best Printing Co. 1938. Pp. 16.
- HÉBERT, MAURICE. *La pureté de la langue française et de la langue anglaise au Canada: Un double principe de plus haute civilisation dans une nécessaire diversité* (Mém. S.R.C., série 3, XXXII, sect. 1, mai, 1938, 149-63). The author maintains that the purity of the French and English languages must be safeguarded in order to attain a higher Canadian culture.
- KENNEDY, RODERICK STUART and ANDERSON, JEAN RITCHIE. *Canadian authors series* (Montreal standard, beginning Jan. 14, 1939). Includes Roberts, Champlain, Richardson, Drummond, Brooke, McGee, Montgomery, Moodie, Osler, Child, Haliburton, Beckwith Hart, Mowat, Kirby, Howe, and Gibbon.
- McKENZIE, RUTH I. *Proletarian literature in Canada* (Dalhousie review, XIX (1), April, 1939, 49-64).
- MACTAVISH, NEWTON. *Ars longa*. Toronto: Ontario Publishing Co. 1938. Pp. x, 236. (\$2.00) Recollections of Canadian artists and their work.
- MASSICOTTE, E.-Z. *La chanson d'Isabeau* (B.R.H., XLV (1), janv., 1939, 15-17). An analysis of the folk song "La Belle Isabeau."
- Un "Digest" canadien d'autrefois (B.R.H., XLIV (12), déc., 1938, 353-4). Louis Ricard founded *L'Echo de la France* in Montreal in 1865. This periodical, which contained articles from French journals in an abridged form, ceased publication in 1869.
- MAURAUULT, OLIVIER. *Adélard Boucher (1835-1912)* (Mém. S.R.C., série 3, XXXII, sect. 1, mai, 1938, 85-97). A biographical account of Adélard Boucher who founded a music store in Montreal in 1861 and played an important part in the musical life of that city in the latter half of the nineteenth century.
- NORTH, STERLING. *The writings of Mazo de la Roche*. Boston: Little, Brown. 1938. Pp. 15.
- ROBSON, ALBERT H. *A. Y. Jackson*. (Canadian artists series.) Toronto: Ryerson Press. 1938. Pp. 32. (\$1.00 cloth; 50c. paper)
- SMITH, A. J. M. *Canadian poetry—a minority report* (University of Toronto quarterly, VIII (2), Jan., 1939, 125-38).

CORRESPONDENCE, NOTES, AND COMMENTS

The enlargement of this issue by the special articles on Lord Durham's *Report* has made it necessary to omit the "Book-notes for Teachers" and the notes on archives and libraries, and on historical societies. They will as usual be included in this section in the September issue.

CANADIAN HISTORICAL ASSOCIATION, ANNUAL MEETING, 1939

The annual meeting of the Canadian Historical Association was held at McGill University, Montreal, on May 25 and 26. The programme was an excellent one throughout, the papers in each session being related to a central theme and being of high quality. The papers of the first session were concerned with French Canada: "The emergence of the *coureur-de-bois* as a social type" by R. M. Saunders, University of Toronto; "The illegal fur trade out of New France, 1713-1760" by Miss A. J. E. Lunn, McGill University; "Life and customs in French villages of the old Illinois country, 1760-1860" by J. M. Carrière, Northwestern University. A session on imperial relations and the issue of reciprocity with the United States had papers from A. C. Cooke, University of British Columbia, Miss Joan Foster, Bryn Mawr College, and L. E. Ellis, Rutgers University. A third session on politics in the 1870's and '80's had papers on Hincks by R. S. Longley, Acadia University; on Macdonald by A. D. Lockhart of Toronto; and on Blake by F. H. Underhill. Professor Herbert Heaton, University of Minnesota, read at the first joint session an amusing and informative paper on the transfer of the Portuguese royal family to Brazil during the Napoleonic War. The presidential address, read at the second joint session by Professor R. G. Trotter, Queen's University, was an interesting and original discussion of the important influence of the Appalachian barrier on Canadian history. All the papers presented will be published in the annual report of the Association, the editor this year being D. G. Creighton, University of Toronto.

Professor T. F. McIlwraith, Royal Ontario Museum of Archaeology, addressed an informal session on the finding of the Viking pieces at Beardmore, northern Ontario, as described in the March issue of the *CANADIAN HISTORICAL REVIEW* by Dr. C. T. Currelly.

A special word of appreciation is due Professor E. R. Adair of McGill University who was in charge of local arrangements and was also chairman of the programme committee. The local arrangements were admirable, in particular the drive to places of historical interest, tea at Mount Bruno by kind invitation of Mr. W. M. Birks, and tea at Royal Victoria College.

Professor J. B. Brebner, Columbia University, was elected president for 1939-40 and Dr. Gustave Lanctot, archivist of the dominion, vice-president. Mr. Norman Fee and Dr. Séraphin Marion both of the Public Archives, Ottawa, were re-elected as English and French secretaries respectively. In its representative attendance and in the general level of interest this meeting was one of the best ever held by the association and shows the effect of a cumulative improvement which has been observable for several years.

THE INTERNATIONAL CONGRESS OF HISTORICAL SCIENCES

[The following letter has been received from Professor Harold Temperley of Cambridge University. It was unfortunately received too late to be included in the March issue. Mr. Temperley was president of the International Congress of Historical Sciences from 1933 to 1938. A reply from Professor E. R. Adair of McGill University follows Mr. Temperley's letter.]

The article in your December number (pp. 387-93) by my friend and former pupil, Professor Adair, on the International Congress of Historical Sciences and its meeting at Zürich in 1938 has been brought to my notice. As I was president of the organization there until I handed over to the new president, Dr. Leland—I venture to think that I ought to draw attention to one or two points of fact—on which Mr. Adair, actually, though of course unintentionally, conveys an incorrect or misleading impression to your readers. I am not referring here, of course, to matters of opinion, but to statements which give a wrong impression.

(1) "The assembly itself was a complete farce . . ." (p. 391). At the last meeting of this body the executive met considerable criticism from an independent member of the assembly, on the form of the budget and its absence of agenda, etc. They promised in both cases to improve matters for the future. Mr. Adair was not, I believe, present at this meeting. I was informed that he had already left Zürich, and his account is incorrect. Among the few activities of the congress which he selects for praise is that of the "considerable number of standing committees [i.e. commissions] most of which carry on very valuable work in providing materials for, and in generally facilitating the business of historical research" (p. 387). When the commissions present their reports, they are always criticized and revised at a meeting of the assembly. At this particular one it was made clear that the assembly approved of the new principle of regional commissions (i.e., for Central Europe, the far east, the near east). They criticized the plan of one commission for publishing selections from the instructions to colonial governors of all nations. They also showed disapproval of the numismatics' commission's suggestion for publishing a corpus of Roman coins. Neither project is likely to survive these criticisms. Many other points could be mentioned, but these are enough to show that the commissions, whose work is praised, owe some of their value to the suggestions and criticism of the assembly. They also owe to it, in each case, their existence.

(2) Mr. Adair says (p. 392), "In his closing address . . . the new president Mr. Waldo Leland of Washington referred to the importance of liberty in the intellectual life; it was unfortunate that in the press reports, either as the result of accident or of discretion, the word 'liberty' was transformed into 'dignity'." The italics are my own. I have before me about a dozen press-cuttings none of which makes the mistake to which Mr. Adair alludes—and I have examined others which are free from it. I have not in fact seen one such as he quotes, and I doubt if the mistake was a common one. I have before me the *Neue Zürcher Zeitung*, which would be recognized by everybody as the fullest and most authoritative press report of the congress. It refers to the speech of Mr. Leland as "noch kraftvoll für die Verständigung der Völker und die Bewahrung verantwortungsbewusster Freiheit in Kultur und Wissenschaft ein." Surely this is clear enough. Members of the congress or, I should say, other historians would not take their reports from the press in any case, if they wished to know what had been said. Mr. Leland referred to, and actually quoted from, a resolution adopted by the assembly of the congress at The Hague in 1932. This resolution is printed in the *Bulletin of the*

International Committee of Historical Sciences (V, pt. IV, no. 21, Dec., 1933, 824). I thought most historians knew of it, but I will quote it in full: "Le Comité international des sciences historiques convaincu que la liberté absolue des recherches, conquise en principe au cours du dernier siècle, est une condition impérieuse des progrès continuels des sciences et des lettres, ayant observé que les luttes politiques, économiques et sociales des temps présents tendent à restreindre cette liberté, fait appel aux gouvernements de toutes les nations civilisées pour leur demander de maintenir la liberté des recherches et des chercheurs dans son intégrité, avec l'idée que la vérité, qui est le but idéal de tous les travaux scientifiques, ne pourra résulter que des efforts et des études diverse d'hommes différents." This resolution was adopted unanimously by the assembly in 1932, and the citation from it by Mr. Leland was greatly applauded in the assembly at Zürich, among others (as I noticed) by representatives of two prominent totalitarian states. In any case the correct text will be published in the official record in our *Bulletin* in due course.

(3) On p. 393: "Five years hence at the invitation conveyed by Signor Volpe, the senior Italian delegate, we [the congress] are to meet in Rome." This statement is both incorrect and misleading at present (February, 1939). Mr. Adair's study of the press did not extend to *The Times*, September 5, 1938—which runs, "Discussion of the Italian Government's invitation to hold the Congress in Rome in 1943 was postponed." So his long string of suggestions as to safeguards, which ought to have been adopted, is still beside the point. The exact situation is as follows. When Signor Volpe conveyed the invitation to the assembly I stated, as president, that it was a matter the assembly must decide. I said that they could not do so at once, but that it would be most carefully considered.

The last session of the assembly at Zürich was expected to refer to this matter—but did not do so, and this was the session from which I think that Mr. Adair was absent. Most deliberately (and as I should have thought for obvious reasons) this matter was left over to be decided at the next assembly which was fixed for Prague in May, 1939. Our historian-hosts of Prague have since intimated (again for intelligible reasons) that they would like to postpone the meeting there till 1940.

The president and the bureau cannot decide the matter alone in 1939, and the assembly will not now meet till 1940. The president has therefore decided (in my opinion rightly) to put the matter to the vote of the national committees who are our constituent bodies. These number some forty in all and generally consist of the leading historians of their countries. Canada, I believe, has not formed one.

Each national committee can (a) vote for Rome, (b) vote against it, or (c) vote that the matter be deferred until the assembly meets in 1940. Signor Volpe has in fact offered certain safeguards and he also declares that the invitation is not from the Italian government as such but from the society of historians. Whether these safeguards are sufficient each national committee must, of course, decide for itself. The decision will go by the majority of the nations voting in their committees.

Mr. Adair's suggestion that a decision has already been taken is incorrect. The votes will not be completed till the end of March, 1939, and no national committee, so far as I know, has yet voted. Even then—in the case of (c)—the decision would be deferred till 1940. Such information as has reached me from different quarters is to the effect that opinions are likely to be much divided between acceptance and rejection. I know of four national committees which are still divided among themselves on the matter. One thing I think that I can assure the readers of your journal and that is, that no national committee (least of all the British one) is likely to decide the matter without considering suggestions and safeguards of the

kind which Mr. Adair has put forward. The whole delay in deciding the question is due to the fact that these considerations were present and that no one thought the assembly was prepared to take a hasty decision about them. Mr. Adair appears to suggest that it was and did.

HAROLD TEMPERLEY

Professor Temperley has dealt with three matters, two important and one quite negligible. Number (2)—the unimportant one—can be very quickly disposed of: it merely concerns an incidental example given by me to show the way the wind was blowing in certain quarters, and there is not a single word in my article that casts the slightest doubt on what Mr. Leland actually said. Mr. Temperley is arguing at length about something that has never been in question.

In regard to number (3) I had before seeing Mr. Temperley's letter written to the editor of the *REVIEW* pointing out that my statement in the matter of the meeting at Rome was liable to misinterpretation and quoting from a letter from Mr. Leland in which he said that the bureau had recommended that the Italian invitation be accepted, but had decided not to place the matter on the agenda for the final meeting of the assembly; in view of what had happened since, it had been referred to the vote of the national committees. This is not quite as Mr. Temperley describes it. Moreover, I did not, as he suggests, set forth a "long string . . . of safeguards, which ought to have been adopted"; I mentioned certain safeguards *which should be taken, before the final decision is made*. Instead of being beside the point, it seems to me to be all the more necessary to emphasize these safeguards, not only in view of the additional assaults upon liberty that Italy has made since last September, but also for the guidance of the committees in their decision—a point that is given still greater value by the fact that the British committee, which speaks for Canada in so far as Canada speaks at all, decided a few weeks ago by a narrow majority to recommend acceptance of the invitation to Rome.

In regard to number (1)—the organization of the Assembly—Mr. Temperley has not met my criticisms in the slightest degree, for he adroitly sidesteps the whole question of administration by discussing what happened at a second meeting of the assembly to which, quite obviously, I was not referring; and even he admits that at this second meeting the executive felt the weight of their omissions sufficiently to persuade them to promise improvement in the future. I am pleased to be able to add that the new president, Mr. Leland, has expressed his complete sympathy with my criticisms in this connection and has undertaken to do his best to see that the slipshod and utterly indefensible procedure followed at Zürich will not be repeated.

There is, however, one valuable matter that Mr. Temperley's letter has brought to the front: *Canada has no active national committee*. It is a member of the International Congress, it pays its quota of the congress's expenses, but there seems to be no committee that can speak for Canada when decisions such as the present one have to be discussed. Apparently, therefore, Canada does not speak at all. If my article has done nothing else, I hope that it may rouse some really active interest in this matter among Canadian historians.

E. R. ADAIR

